

➤ HEBRAICA. ◀

VOL. VII.

APRIL, 1891.

No. 3.

THE COLLOQUY OF MOSES ON MOUNT SINAI.

BY ISAAC H. HALL,

Metropolitan Museum, New York City.

This colloquy is one of the compositions contained in a manuscript received by me in June, 1889, from Urmî, from which "The Story of Arsenius King of Egypt" has already appeared in HEBRAICA. The colloquy occupies the first fifteen pages of the manuscript, and, like the other portions, is pretty fairly written, with abundant points. The scribe has made a number of obvious clerical slips, and a great many mistakes in the pointing. The voyage dampened the mucilaginous ink in spots, causing the pages to stick together, and tear when separated, adding more pains in decipherment than one likes to spend over a modern copy; but not more than one word was thus rendered doubtful. The scribe's abbreviations I have generally spelled out, denoting the letters thus added by inclosing them in brackets. The pointing I have not thought worth while to retain, except in spots where, for one reason or another, it seemed desirable. The punctuation in our sense, however, I have retained, chiefly to show how necessary it is for the translator to disregard it. When punctuation (like our colon) follows letters supplied in brackets, it is a note of abbreviation merely, and I might perhaps better have omitted it.

Except the textual notes added to the text and translation, there seems no need of comment. Much might be added, however, to show that, whatever be the origin and transmission of the story, it has much in common with the Nestorian church services; some of it (for instance) coinciding verbally with passages in the order for the first Saturday of the Great Fast, or Lent.

But I shall not attempt to go into the origin of the story, nor of its age. I know of no other Syriac copy of the story, but a Karshun version appears to exist in the British Museum (7209 Rich, No. 16. See Rosen and Forshall's Cat., 109-

111; compare Wright's Cat. III. 1309); also at Berlin, Sachau 7. 4; and in the "Alter Bestand," Pet. I. 24, Sachau's Verz. 57. Of these Karshun copies, that in the British Museum seems to bear date A.D. 1788; those in Berlin, 1699 and 1571 respectively.

The following are the text and translation.

[אֲמַרְתָּ מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד]

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד וְעַתָּה מִיָּד

* Read תָּפַח

[illegible]

* The word is accidentally thus repeated by the scribe.

† The word is blotted, but I think this is correct. The other barely possible reading is **مَعْدِنٌ**. In the order for the first Saturday for Lent, where identical or parallel expressions with several passages here occur, the word is **مِنْدٌ** "sleep," a synonym of the word I read in the above text.

[illegible]

* Perhaps , is to be read.

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

وَمِنْهُمْ مَن مَّا لَمْ يَأْتِ الْبُرْهَانَ وَهُوَ مُكَذِّبٌ ۖ فَتَعَذِّبْهُمْ بِمَا كَانُوا يَكْفُرُونَ ۚ

(TRANSLATION.)

[THE NARRATIVE OF MOSES THE APPROVED IN PROPHECY.]

Once again, in the strength of the Being, the servant full of sin begins to write this Narrative of Moses the Elect in Prophecy.

When Moses went up to the mount of Sinai to speak with God, and received the Old Covenant—and in it are the commandments to the children of Israel, and the laws and judgments, that they should keep them—and the fasting of the prophet Moses was in the month of Heziran [i. e., June], in the hot days of summer, until the law descended and he received it. Now Moses began to ask of his Lord, O my Lord and my God, teach me what I ask of thee.

And God said to him, What dost thou request? And Moses answered and said to him, O my Lord, He who satisfies the hungry, what wilt thou give as his reward? And God said to him, He who satisfies the hungry for my sake, I will satisfy him with my Holy Spirit; and he who clothes the naked for my name's sake, I will clothe him with a robe of the light of my divinity, and I will deliver him in the last day, and into judgment he shall not come. And Moses said, O my Lord, He who does not feed the poor that knocks* at his door, what wilt thou give him as his reward? God said to him, I will drive him from the door of Paradise, and will not suffer him to see my light.

And Moses answered and said, O my Lord, he who gives water to drink on the waysides, what is his reward? God said to him, I will give him to drink the water of life, that he thirst not forever, and I will rescue him from the flame of fire.

And Moses answered and said, He that breaks the heart of the poor, what wilt thou requite him? And God said to him, According as he broke the heart of the poor, [so] he broke my heart, and I will cast him into the fire of Gehenna. And Moses said, He that has compassion on the poor, giving them food and drink, and clothing them, and doing the desire of their heart, and doing good by them, what wilt thou do by them? And God said to him, He that does good with them

* As the MS. is, we must read "kisses"; but the emendation requires only the transposition of a letter.

+ *Sic*, but probably a slip for "him."

does it with me. I will make him inherit the kingdom of heaven, and I will delight him with life eternal, which shall not pass away nor be dissolved.

And Moses said, He that gives a shroud to a brother believer in the day of his death, what wilt thou do by him? And God said to him, I will clothe him with a robe of the light of my divinity, and I will pardon him [his] sins. And Moses answered and said, He that digs the grave of a departed brother believer, what is his reward? God said to him, I will write his name in the book of life with the prophets and apostles and martyrs and saints, and I will make him inherit the kingdom of heaven. According as he honored the body of my believer,* I will honor him in the last day. And Moses said, My Lord and my God, He that walks with the bier of the dead, and bears the dead, in the way, when they are bringing him to the grave, what wilt thou give him as his reward? God said to him, I will write for him [for] every walk one recompense, and I will forgive him his debts.

And Moses answered and said to him, He that prays in the night, when men sleep, what is his reward? God† said to him, I will make him that he sleep not the sleep‡ of sin, even as I sleep not; and I will make him a watcher [i. e., angel] forever, and I will raise him to life [or, save him] in the day of the resurrection. And Moses said, He that prays at the risings of the morning and of the sun, what wilt thou give him as his reward? And God said to him, I will forgive him his sins, and I will write his name with the martyrs and confessors, and will write for him for every word one recompense. And Moses said, He that prays at the third hour, what wilt thou recompense him? And God said to him, I will enrich his possessions; the blessings of Abraham shall be in his house. And Moses said, He that prays the prayer of the sixth hour, what is his reward? God said to him, The door of Paradise shall be opened before him. And Moses answered and said to his Maker, He that prays the prayer of the ninth hour, what is his reward? And God said to him, Nine heavenly blessings shall be in his house, and I will multiply him his possessions, and will delight him in this world and in that which is to come. And Moses answered and said, He that prays the prayer of the setting of the sun, what is his reward? And God said to him, I will release [his] debts and the debts of his father, and I will make his portion and his inheritance in the kingdom of heaven; and I will not deliver him up to darkness, but I will make him to rejoice and exult in the light of my divinity. And Moses said, He that prays the prayer of [the time of] sleep, what is his reward? God said to him, I will hear his prayer, and will make pass from him the evil of the

* Or, "my body the believer."

† The scribe has accidentally repeated this word. Or else render: "God said unto him, I God will make," etc.

‡ The word is blotted and obscured, but I think this reading is right. The only other (barely) possible one is "death." The passage seems suggested by the order of service for the first Saturday of Lent, where the reading is (a different word for) "sleep."

night. Hear, O* Moses, what I say to thee. He that prays or fasts or watches or labors for my sake, I will recompense him with his reward in the two worlds, and I will make him inherit life eternal, and he shall be glad in the light of my countenance, and I will give him delight in my kingdom.

And Moses said, He that lends anything to another, what wilt thou give him? God said, I will recompense him a hundred-fold; and every one that does evil to his fellow does it to me; and I will requite him from my good things, and I will deliver him from distress and from snares. Every one that does evil by his fellow, I also will torment him and bring upon him all manner of evils and chastisements. O thou Moses, according as ye shall be in love one with another, so also I will be among you; and if 'ye' show kindness one to another, I also will show kindness to you. But if ye be angry one with another, I also will be angry with you. And every one that does evil with [his fellow, upon him]† I will bring every evil and every chastisement.

And Moses said, He that commits uncleanness with boys, what wilt thou give [him] as his reward? God said, Let his conduct and his power be with...‡ And Moses said, He that commits uncleanness with beasts? And God said to him, O Moses, if he be a man of full understanding, it is fitting that he fast a year, and pray and repent; and then let him enter the church and receive the oblation; and I will pardon his sins. But if he be a boy without understanding, let them fast for him three months. And Moses said, He that commits uncleanness, and repenting is confirmed in his repentance? God said to him, If so, Moses, I will both forgive his sins and write his name with the penitent. And Moses said, He that commits uncleanness and dies without repentance, what wilt thou requite him? God said, I will put on his neck a collar of fire, and he shall be tortured with demons in Gehenna, until he become the ridicule of all men to the day of the resurrection. But, O thou Moses, dost thou not understand that for the cause of uncleanness I was angry at Sodom and Gomorra, and I burned them with fire; and for the cause of uncleanness of§ the youth I also overthrew Nineveh?

And Moses said, He who smites upon his head because of the dead? God said, As one that took a spear and pierced me, so is he. And Moses said, He that rears the fatherless, because of the recompense? God said, I will write for him for that soul every day a thousand mercies. And Moses said, He that gives food with respect of persons? God said, He has no recompense with me. And he said, He that gives food as a tribute to the name of the departed, although he

* The pointing *may* mean that this particle is to be taken as the Greek *εὖ*, "well."

† Evidently the scribe has omitted a word or two here; but the sense must be essentially that of the words which I have supplied.

‡ The scribe has omitted a word here. Perhaps "them," or "boys" is to be supplied.

§ The scribe has written "and" for "of"; a very easy mistake in Nestorian script.

may [thus] become poor, what wilt thou give him? God said, According as he made deprivation to himself, and gave food to the poor and the needy, a hundred-fold will I recompense him, and I will show mercy for that tribute.

And Moses said, He that steals or defrauds or robs what is another's?—If he repay him that which he has defrauded or robbed, and repent, I will forgive his debts. And if he repents but does not repay his debts, I will command my fiery angels to cast upon his neck chains of fire, and to bind him with the wicked in Gehenna; and to torment him without mercy. O Moses, mine is the power and the might and the valor. I do not require that there should be a collar on the neck of man, but upon the mountains and the islands, and on the neck of demons, who are enemies of men.

And Moses said, He that removes the landmark of his neighbor, little or much, what is his reward? God said, I will make a collar of fire and chains upon his neck, if he do not return it to its place.

Moses said, My Lord and my God, he that steals or kills? God said, As he had no mercy upon his fellow, I also will have no mercy upon him, nor shall it [i. e., mercy] be upon him forever.

And Moses said, He that reviles his father or his mother, or makes a mock of them, what wilt thou give him? God said to him, I will not hear his prayer, nor receive his petition, but I will cast him down to Gehenna, though he were Abraham the father of nations.

And Moses said, He who lends money [*lit.*, *z u z a*, a drachma] to others, and does not take from them increase or usury, what wilt thou give him? God said, I will multiply his possessions, and will pardon his debts, and will write his name in the book of life with the martyrs and holy ones. But he that takes interest or usury, I will set thieves in authority over him, who will steal from him his possessions, and I will make him the fellow of Qâin, that he may be tormented in Gehenna.

Moses said, He that puts peace among men, what wilt thou recompense him? God said, He shall be my beloved and friend, and I will make him inherit the kingdom of heaven.—And he that puts strife and murder among men, what wilt thou give him? God said to him, He shall be far from me, and I will not suffer him to enter my kingdom. His dwelling shall be with the demons in Gehenna. Know also, O Moses, that he that oppresses his fellow oppresses me, and he that honors another honors me. O good Moses, command thy family, the children of Israel, that they be merciful towards the poor, and the widows, and the miserable. Let them not be oppressed.* Lo, I will hear the voice of their crying, and their groaning will come near to me, and sicken my heart; and I cannot endure their oppressions. Speak also to them and teach them: If they turn not from their

* Perhaps it is better to punctuate thus: "poor. And the widows and the miserable, let them not be oppressed."

wicked thoughts, and give alms to the fatherless, I will pour out my wrath upon them, and will destroy them from their small even to their great. With me there is neither master nor servant, nor respect of persons; but I will recompense to every man according to his works, whether good or whether evil.

After that God said to the Mount of Sinai, Be lifted up. And Mount Sinai was lifted up, and there was between heaven and the prophet Moses about a cubit. And Moses looked and saw all creation like a small brow. And God said, Ask, Moses, whatever thou desirest. And when Moses heard, he said also to God thus: O my Lord, art thou near or far, that I may come at thee? And when God heard that Moses said to him thus, he said to him, I am exalted above all, and I am lower than all; and there is nothing beneath me. In every spot am I, and in every place I dwell. And Moses said,* O my Lord, what is thy clothing, and thy food? And God (glory to his Name!) said, My food is the tears of sinners that repent and turn to repentance, and my clothing is the praises of the angels and the repentance of men. And Moses said, How wast thou existent before thou createdst the heaven and the earth? And God said, I was existing with the reverend throne. And Moses said, What was that throne? and who were bearing it up? Where wast thou existent before the throne? And God said to him, The throne was light and fire and flame, and it was upon the shoulders of four angels, one in the likeness of the figure of a man, and one in the likeness of the figure of an eagle, one in the likeness of the figure of a lion, and one the figure of a bull. And above the throne was nothing, save Me alone, the Maker of the heaven and the earth. O thou Moses, this heaven in which are the stars and the sun and the moon, it is also a firmament in the likeness of glass, and above it there are waters. And there is another heaven scarlet, and above it a sea of fire; and the third heaven, that is my throne. Those angels that bear up the throne have each [*lit.*, he has] three hundred thousand mouths, and in every mouth three hundred thousand tongues, which utter praise in three hundred thousand variations, every one of them in its own voice [*lit.*, in one voice; i. e., language or cry not human], glorifying and extolling and singing praises and ascribing honor to my great Name; and there is no one tongue among them that is like another [*lit.*, there are not among them tongues that are like one another]. And amidst the four angels that bear up the throne, and between each and his fellow, are thirty thousand camps of cherubs and seraphs and angels and arch-angels, who are without number; a thousand thousands and a myriad of myriads, and more than the stars of heaven and the sand that is on the shore of the sea; and they glorify and sing praises and ascribe honor to my great and awful Name, without restraint and without ceasing. And, O thou Moses, according as I willed I created and brought into being from nothing everything that is

* This word is accidentally repeated by the scribe.

† By an easy slip the scribe has written "and" for "of."

in the heaven, and whatsoever is of the earth, and all that is in the seas and on the mountains.

And Moses said, O my Lord, whither does thy face look? to the east, or to the west, or to the north, or to the south? God said, If thou desire to know, make a fire, and gaze into it, Moses, and see where is its face. And Moses answered and said [O] God, I gazed into the fire, and I saw that in all of its convolution [is] its face. And God said, Thus am I, O Moses, in every spot and in every place; and full of me are the heaven and the earth and the seas and the mountains; and I am in the height and in the depth, above all and beneath all; and there is no place that is void of me, but the place of infidels and oppressors, and the region where they know me not, and the place—in which is no faith—of them that worship images the work of men's hands.

And Moses said, O my Lord, dost thou sleep, or not? And God said, O my servant Moses, I sleep not forever and ever. Take in thy hand a cup of water. And Moses did so as God said to him. And God cast a sleep on Moses, and he was sunk in sleep, and the cup fell from his hand, and the water within it was spilt. And Moses was awaked from his sleep, ashamed; and God said to him, O Moses, by my mighty arm, if I should fall asleep, the heaven and that which is in the earth would fall, just as the cup from thy hand and the water was spilt.

And Moses said to him, O my Lord, I beseech that I may see thee with my eyes. God said to him, Thou art not able to see me, O Moses. But he answered and said to him, If I see thee, I will say to the children of Israel that I have seen God, and I will speak the truth with them. And God said, Arise, pray, O Moses. After that he arose and prayed and prostrated himself ten times; then he looked up and saw that the heaven was opened at the divine beck, [an opening] in the likeness of a needle's eye. And Moses fell upon his face, and darkened his eyes, for Moses was not able to look with them. And when he was awakened from his trance, then he said, Great is thy honor; no one is able to search therein save those who, pure in their heart, behold the rays of thy divinity.

And after that God said to the mount of Sinai, Descend.

And after those things, God said to him, O Moses, after a little cometh the hour that they [i. e., the children of Israel] shall see me, and I shall be in the likeness of one of them; and I will heal their wounded, and make whole their diseased, and raise their dead; but they will deny me, and crucify me upon the wood. O Moses, unless I descend to your father Adam, he [and] his descendants will remain in Gehenna. But I declared to him when I created him, [saying,] In the latter times I will deliver thee by one Man whom I shall clothe from thee [i. e., with thy humanity]. Prophecy it of me, and say that I will be thy descendant. And I said to him when I created him, Lift up thine eyes on high. And he lifted up his eyes; and I said, What seest thou? He said to me, I saw a tree [lit., wood] above my head. And I said to him again, Rightly thou speakest. And he said, O my Lord, what is this wood, which is above my head? It is like

me, in the figure of a cross. I said, O Adam, look up, look three times. And I said to him, What seest thou? He said to me, I saw One in the image and in the likeness of me, who is crucified on the wood; his hands and his feet fastened [*lit.*, they are fastening] with nails, and a crown of thorns is put on his head.

And I showed to thy father Adam alone that which I have said to thee. O Moses, heaven and earth shall pass away: one *yud* or one stroke [or mark, or letter] from my word shall not pass away. I said to thy father Adam, For thy sake, O Adam, I will send the Son my Word [or, my Son the Word]; it shall put on humanity and shall be man. They will crucify him, and through his cross he shall redeem you. And thou Moses, I make [it] known to thee, until your* father Adam shall return to his garden and to Paradise from which he went out. He was driven out because he ate from the tree; and I expelled him from those good things. O thou Moses, then I declared to him, "I will redeem thee." And I will deliver him, him and his sons, from Gehenna. O Moses, when Adam trod under foot my commandment, and ate from the tree, and died the death of sin, and I drove him from the garden of delights, and he inherited the earth of curses, and went to Gehenna because he trod under foot my commandment, between me and him was this word, that I would descend and deliver him and his sons, and that I would not leave them in the hands of Satan and his torment. O thou Moses, this is the word between me and your* father Adam: After five thousand five hundred years I will descend to deliver him, and will pay his debts and sins; and I shall receive mocking; and spitting upon my face, and they shall fix nails in my hands and feet, and put on my head a crown of thorns, and smite me with a spear, and kill me; and I shall die, and through my death I shall raise Adam and his children to life from the death of sin; and they shall bury me, and I shall rise from the grave after three days; and I shall ascend to heaven and take up with me Adam and his children, and make him inherit the kingdom of heaven. But the Jews, I will scatter them through creation, and take from them the priesthood and the kingdom and the prophecy, and give them to be stained black, so that they shall be as dogs hated of every one. Blessed are they that believe in me: woe to them that deny me.—And after that God said to Moses, Go down from the mount of Sinai. And Moses went down, and went to the children of Israel, and recounted to them how God had spoken to him. What he saw and what he heard he said to them.—Glory to God the Father, and to the Son, and to the Holy Spirit, even forever and ever. Amen and Amen.—Ends the Narrative of Mar Moses, by the hands of the weak and sinful priest Zerwanda, son of the brother of Mar Yohanan. Pray for my contemptibility. Amen.

* MS. "our," through the omission of two letters. Perhaps that reading is meant, however.

CORRIGENDA.—Page 163, last line of Syriac, for ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ read ܡܫܝܚܐ ܕܡܪܝܢܐ . Page 163, second foot-note, for for Lent read before, or at the beginning of, Lent. Page 165, line 4 from bottom, for ܕܡܫܝܚܐ read ܕܡܫܝܚܐ . Page 165, last line, for ܡܫܝܚܐ read ܡܫܝܚܐ .

THE MOABITE STONE AND THE HEBREW RECORDS.

BY PROFESSOR JOHN D. DAVIS,

Princeton Theological Seminary.

According to the latest recensions of the text, the opening sentences of the Moabite stone, so far as they pertain to the present subject, are: "I am Mesha son of Chemosh-melek, king of Moab, the Dibonite. My father reigned over Moab thirty years and I reigned after my father. And I made this high place for Chemosh. . . . because he saved me from all the kings and let me feast my eyes on all that hated me. Omri was king of Israel and he afflicted Moab for many days, because Chemosh was angry with his land. And his son succeeded him; and he also said: 'I will afflict Moab.' In my days he said thus; but I feasted my eyes on the humiliation of him and his house; and as for Israel, it perished with everlasting destruction. Now Omri had taken possession of the land of Medeba; and [Israel] dwelt in it during his days and half his son's [or sons'] days, forty years: but Chemosh restored it in my days."

The Hebrew records, it will be remembered, assign to the four kings of the house of Omri a combined reign of forty-four years; place the revolt of Mesha after the death of Omri's son Ahab, during the reign of Ahaziah; and ascribe the war of attempted resubjugation to Jehoram, Omri's grandson and last king of the line.

Prof. Driver, the last who has expressed an opinion and who but gives utterance to a wide-spread thought, says: "The revolt of Moab from Israel, noticed briefly in II Kgs. i. 1 = 3,5. . . . is there stated to have taken place after the death of Ahab; but from line 8 of the inscription it is evident that this date is too late, and that in fact it must have been completed by the middle of Ahab's reign:" and again, "Mesha's revolt took place in the middle of Ahab's reign, not after his death (as stated, II Kgs. i. 1)," (Notes on Text of Samuel).

Thus the stone of Moab and the Hebrew records are found contradictory. We presume, however, that the Oxford professor and all sharers of his view freely concede that a war (if not the war) for the re-conquest of Moab was conducted by Jehoram, as the Hebrew scriptures state; and hold that a correct history of the times should narrate the Moabite revolt about the middle of Ahab's reign, and a war of attempted re-conquest at the beginning of Jehoram's.

The first inquiry concerns the date of the stone. 1. It is a memorial stele; not commemorative merely of Moab's recovery of independence from Israel, but retrospective of the reign of Mesha. It records the capture of numerous Israel-

itish cities by Mesha, it is true : but it also recounts the war against Dedan which resulted in the recovery of Horonaim by Moab ; describes Mesha's works of peace, the repair of the ruins of war, the fortification of his capital, the erection therein of a royal palace and of reservoirs, and the construction of a highway by the river Arnon ; and the stone is dedicated by him to the god who had saved him, not from Omri's son merely, but from all the kings, and had let him feast his eyes on all that hated him. 2. Whatever may have been the date of the revolt from Israel, the monument was certainly not erected until after the death of Ahab ; for Mesha knows how long Ahab reigned, saying : "Omri took the land of Medeba and [Israel] dwelt therein during his days and half the days of his son." 3. The stone was erected after disaster had befallen the sons of Ahab also, perhaps even after the extinction of his family, which shortly followed his own death ; for Mesha says of Ahab : "I have feasted my eyes on him and on his house," i. e., have seen the utter humiliation of both. By the humbling of Ahab's family may be meant only the frustration of Jehoram's attempt at re-conquest ; but the reference would be even more appropriate to the work of Jehu, whereby the house of Omri was overthrown and all its members murdered. 4. There is perhaps confirmation for a time during the reign of Jehu. Mesha says : "And as for Israel, it perished with everlasting destruction." These may be words of oriental exaggeration : but there was a time, however, when they would have been fitly spoken ; for when, immediately after the fall of Omri's house, Moab saw Samaria subjected to the Assyrian yoke, and when a few years later Hazael ravaged Israel and wrested from Jehu the region east of the Jordan, Israel seemed to have indeed "perished with everlasting destruction." To judge, therefore, from Mesha's own words, the stele was erected late in his reign after the death of Ahab, after the humiliation of that house also ; and, not improbably, after the extinction of the line of Omri by Jehu and the entrance of Israel into its period of dire distress.

The second inquiry concerns the actual statements and authenticity of the Hebrew records. What do the Hebrews testify ? They say nothing about a Moabite revolt in the days of Ahab ; but they connect one with the death of Ahab, relate its outbreak in the course of the narrative of the next, i. e., Ahaziah's reign, record the war of attempted suppression in the days of his successor Jehoram, and seem to imply that tribute had been rendered down to the date of Ahab's fall. And this account may not be lightly set aside. For 1. The Hebrew date suits the circumstances connected with Ahab's death. Historically the time was eminently fitting for a revolt. During the reign of Ahab, intermarriages between the royal families of Israel and Judah, by terminating hostilities for a time, caused these kingdoms to again present a united front to their common enemy Moab. At the battle of Ramoth-gilead, however, not only was the powerful monarch at the head of the northern realm slain, whereby the reins of

government fell into the hands of the weak Ahaziah, but the united armies of both northern and southern kingdoms were defeated. The time was opportune for Moab to revolt. 2. Again a general revolt at that time is abundantly manifest from Hebrew history. A month or so after Jehoshaphat had returned to Jerusalem from the disastrous battle at Ramoth-gilead, his kingdom was threatened with invasion by the allied armies of Moab, Ammon and Edom. That danger having been warded off, Jehoshaphat was soon after summoned by his kinsman Jehoram to assist the Israelites to re-subjugate Moab. 3. The Hebrew record further dates the attempted re-conquest of Moab after the death of Ahab by the mention of persons. The war is conducted by Jehoram, who shortly followed Ahab on the throne; and the prophet Elisha, who succeeded Elijah after the death of Ahab, is mentioned as present. 4. The credibility of the Hebrew record for this period is abundantly and minutely confirmed by monumental evidence. The Assyrian measurement of the interval from Ahab to Jehu is apparently the same as the Hebrew. The Assyrian tablets and the Hebrew records alike make Ahab of Israel and Ben-hadad of Damascus contemporaries and allies, place the death of Ben-hadad in the same position relatively to concomitant events, define it to within three years of its occurrence, name Hazael of Damascus as successor of Ben-hadad, mention Hazael and Jehu as contemporaries and refer to each in the same year relatively to the death of Ben-hadad.

Such complete consistency among all the statements of the Hebrew record for this period, such minute agreement with the details of the Assyrian annals, lend to the Hebrew declarations an authority not lightly to be rejected. Were then choice between the credibility of the Hebrew and the Moabite stories necessary, preference might justly be claimed for the former on the ground that it is derived from annals of the kingdom presumably contemporary with the events, whereas Mesha had his stone inscribed a considerable time after the revolt; that the general authenticity of the Hebrew narrative is abundantly confirmed, while the credibility of Mesha is unknown; and especially on the ground that the Hebrew record deals with domestic affairs, while the Moabite king's note of time is a reference to the internal history of a realm foreign to Moab.

But we do not think that a choice between the Hebrew recital and Mesha's account is necessary. We are glad to believe in the historical accuracy of both. The statements of the two documents may be reconciled in one of two ways:

They may be combined much in the manner already suggested; the recovery of Medeba by the Moabites being assigned to the middle of Ahab's reign, and the general revolt of Moab, allied with Ammon and Seir, to the period after the death of Ahab. The course of events would then be as follows: Omri, before his accession, while commander of the armies of Israel, crushed the power of the Moabites and opened their country to the Israelites for settlement. Despite the vicissitudes which befell the northern kingdom, the Israelitish inhabitants of this

remote district, occupying as they did fortified towns, easily retained possession of the conquered domain and raised the imposed tribute. At length when Omri's successor Ahab was entangled in war with the Syrians, Mesha found himself sufficiently strong to oust the Israelites from the extreme eastern and isolated town of Medeba; but, like many a subject prince of mediæval history, while he did not hesitate, when the occasion offered, to dispossess his liege lord of a goodly castle, nevertheless remained a vassal. Other cities lost by his father, Mesha did not undertake to recover until the catastrophe at Ramoth-gilead made revolt possible. Looking back over many years and recounting the exploits of his long reign, Mesha, in no wise contradicting but only unintentionally supplementing the Hebrew account, truthfully says: "Omri had taken possession of Medeba, and Israel dwelt therein during his days and half his son's days, forty years; but Chemosh restored it in my days."

There is another and preferable explanation. It rests upon a well-grounded assumption and on two facts. The assumption is that the inscription of Mesha was engraved not simply as late as the reign of Jehoram, which is proven, but after the destruction of Omri's house by Jehu, which as already seen is more than consistent with the narrative, being probable. The facts are first that the name "son of Omri" was not restricted to Ahab, but was a common designation for any descendant of Omri on the throne of Israel. To name thus Omri's lineal successors was in accordance with that well-known custom of the times whereby members of a royal line were denominated sons of the founder thereof. Several examples from the Assyrian records are cited by Schrader (*KAT.* 190 Anm.**). So this stone mentions the occupant of Horonaim, not by his personal, but by his family name "son of Dedan" (l. 31). So too the stone, while it knows that name of terror Omri the conqueror, knows his royal successor only by the indefinite designation of "his son." So too another contemporary monument of stone gives to Jehu, who was not even of the lineage of Omri but only a successor, the title "son of Omri." "Son of Omri" was thus the common designation for any king of Omri's line. The second fact is that the three letters בנה can be a plural form, meaning "his sons." The Moabitish plural absolute is uniformly written defectively. Likewise plural nouns in union with a pronominal suffix generally show no ך. In line 8, the line in question, the words "his days" are represented by the three letters מיה. In line 20, where occurs the sentence, "I took of Moab 200 men, even all its chiefs," the words "its chiefs" are expressed by three letters רשה. In line 22, the pronominal suffix is appended to the feminine plural מגרלת naturally without an intervening ך. In but one case is ך used. Thus while the letters בנה may be a noun in the singular number, as in l. 6, they can with equal propriety represent the plural "his sons."

The course of the history was this: Omri, the commander of Israel's armies during the two years of the reign of Elah (I Kgs. xvi. 16), conquered and crushed

Moab and opened the territory to Israelitish settlement. The same or the following year he became king; and, though his authority was for a while disputed by a rival, the Moabites had no power left to rise against the Israelitish occupants of the walled towns. Apace with Moab's recovery of strength, grew the authority and power of Omri and Ahab. Their house moreover formed alliance by matrimony with the royal family of Judah. Not until the united forces of Judah and Israel were defeated at Ramoth-gilead and Ahab himself slain, were the Moabites spirited enough and courageous enough, with the help of the Ammonites and Edomites, to strike for freedom. They tried and succeeded. The revolt divided the reign of Omri's sons in twain, and gave to the latter half of their dominion a far different aspect in Moabitish eyes from the former. Looking back over many years, recounting events previous to as well as during his own reign, and being acquainted with the fateful history of Omri's dynasty, Mesha records: "Omri was king over Israel and afflicted Moab many days. . . . And his son succeeded him and he also said: 'I will afflict Moab.' He said thus in my days; but I feasted my eyes on him and on his house; and as for Israel, it perished with everlasting destruction." And then, after thus mentioning the fall of the first of the sons and of that son's house, knowing the lineal descendants of Omri simply as "his sons," Mesha resumes: "Now Omri had taken possession of Medeba and Israel dwelt therein during his days and half the days of his sons, forty years; but Chemosh restored it in my days."

ASSYRIAN ETYMOLOGIES.¹

BY REV. W. MUSS-ARNOLT, PH. D.,

Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Md.

I.) Tup-šikku = a badge of servitude.

Lyon (*Sargon-texte*, 36, l. 56) and Peiser (*KB.* II. 48 fol.) read al-lu um-šik-ku u-ša-aš-ši,² translated by the one *I let them carry the allu and um-šikku*, by the other *I caused them to bring allu and tribute*.

Esarhaddon (I R. 47, Col. V. 1sq.) says niše mâtâtî hu-bu-ut kaš-ti-ia IÇ al-lu um-šik-ku u-ša-aš-ši-šu-nu-ti (*KB.* II. 134), translated by Abel: *Ich legte Frohndienste auf*.

Asurbanipal, Col. X. 89sq., relates, according to *KB.* II. 234: šarrâni (mâtû) A-ri-bi ša ina a-di-ia iḫ-tu-u ša ina kabal tam-ḥa-ri bal-tu-us-su-nu u-ḡab-bi-tu ina kâtê, a-na e-peš bît-ri-du-u-ti šu-a-tu (iḡu) al-lu tup(b)-šik-ku u-ša-aš-ši-šu-nu-ti u-ša-az-bi-la ku-dur-ri la-bi-in libnâti-šu za-bi-lu tup-šik-ki-šu, etc.; rendered by Jensen: *Die Könige von Arabien, die sich gegen die mir [geleisteten] Eide vergangen hatten, die ich im Sturme der Schlacht lebendig mit den Händen gepackt hatte, liess ich, um jenes Frauenhaus zu bauen, Bürdejoch und Arbeitermütze tragen und das Traggeflecht schleppen. Seine Ziegel streichend, seine Bürde schleppend* (brachten sie unter Gesang und Spiel ihre Tage hin).²

The (iḡ) allu is a *chain*, or a *yoke*, from alalu, to *bind*.³ Every one has

¹ Presented to the American Oriental Society at its meeting, October, 1890.

² Also see Winckler, *Sargon* 32, 189, il-ku muš-šik-ku emidsunuti translated *ibid.*, *Steuern und Frohndienste legte ich ihnen auf*; cf. *ibid.* 44, 270; 112, 83. *ZA.* III. 314, 69, etc. The word mu-šik-ki, Winckler, *Sargon*, p. 96, 8; 146, 6, etc., is another word than the one under discussion.

³ So Del. *ALS.*³ (vocabulary); ZB. 5, rem. 1; according to *HEBRAICA*, I. 230, alalu means to *hang*; so also Guyard, *Notes*, §§ 36, rem. 1, and 66; *ZK.* II. 21. Asurb. II. 10 mentions allu huragi a *gold chain*; another word for chain is naḥutu, also from alalu; see e. g. V R. 15, 48 d, where it follows ma-a[k-ḡaru] and ḡan-nu and precedes ḡan-nu and ḡu-u (𐎶𐎵, 𐎶𐎵𐎶). ḡannu is to be connected with Hebr. 𐤒𐤒 to *build a nest, to rest, to crouch*. Del. *ALS.*, p. 80, Col. II. 1 and 3, we read ḡin-nu ḡa-an-[na-nu] and ḡu-un-nu-[nu]; kalbu ḡun-nu is a chained dog, or a dog crouching down; *Deluge* 109 we read ilani kima kalbe ḡun-nu-nu, ina ka-ma-a-ti rab-ḡu; also V R. 45, Col. VII. 41, tu-ḡa-an-na-an. See, however, Jensen, *Kosmologie*, p. 428 and 517.—II R. 51, 32 cd, we read A-dar(?) ša al-li (*ZA.* II. 211sq.). See, also, Jensen, *Kosm.* 392, and Del. *Wörterbuch.* ad 𐎶𐎵. Connected with allu no doubt is allu happu, a Semitic word, notwithstanding Scheil's clever remarks in *BOR.* IV. 44sq., and Sayce's dictum in *ZK.* II. 207, who derives even allu from the Akkadian. From the same alalu we have ul-lu in ul-li kal-bi a *dog-collar*, Asurb. VIII. 28 and IX. 108, connected by Jensen (*ZK.* I. 299 and II. 21) and Professor Haupt (*HEBRAICA*, I. 230) with Hebr. 𐤒𐤒, Arabic 𐤒𐤒.

seen pictures of prisoners and slaves, brought before the Assyrian kings. As a rule they wear a rope or a chain around their neck; and this I call the *allu*.

It cannot but be confusing to the mind of the "layman" that in the same volume, *KB. II.*, Peiser, Winckler, Abel, etc., read *um-šikku*, while Jensen transcribes *tup-šikku*, the former deriving the word from an Assyrian stem, the latter from an Akkadian original; at least on p. 292 of *KB. II.* he says: *tup-šikku* = *kudurru* = "*Ziegelbrett*," which was carried or worn on the head; a compound of *tuppu*, *board*, and *šig* (*šeg*), *brick*; see also Jensen, *Kosmologie*, 494.

The three characters, which make up the word, have been read *muššikku*, *umšikku* and *tupšikku*.

1. Praetorius in *ZDMG.* 27, 514, line 8sq., reads *muššikku* deriving it from *našaku* = Hebr. נָסַךְ, to *anoint* (as king); his development of the word was *anointment, kingdom, crown* = *kudurru*. Schrader (*ibid.* 28, 128), criticizing this interpretation, translates "*sovereignty*," comparing Hebr. מָסַךְ Isa. xxii. 8 and מִסְכָּה *ibid.* xxv. 7, from נָסַךְ to *cover*, to *protect*, protection implying on the part of the king *sovereignty*. Delitzsch in Baer-Del. *Daniel*, præf. xi-xii, adopts reading and etymology from נָסַךְ, but considers it an article for wearing on the head, to cover it. Also Winckler, *Sargon-texte*, reads *muššikku*, translating it by *Frohnden*.

2. The reading *um-šik-ku* has been advocated, among others, by Lyon, *Sargon-texte*, p. 59, 5, and it has become the generally accepted reading.

3. Jensen proposed the reading *tup-šikku*, considering it a compound of the two "Akkadian" words *tup-dub*, *board, tablet*, and *šig* (*šeg*) = *brick*. In the majority of cases, as far as I have been able to examine them, we have the sign *tup* (with four upright wedges); this undoubtedly favors the reading *tup* (*dub*). In addition to this we read in a hymn, published in *ZA.* iv. 110sq. on p. 133, 100 and 112, *ba-bi-il tu-ub-ši-kam* (translated, *ibid.*, *bringing a blessing*), which means *bringing or carrying the tupšikku*.

I, thus, agree with Jensen in reading *tup-šikku*; with Jensen I believe that it is a compound consisting of *tup*+*šikku*; but I differ with him as regards the etymology of the word. It is not from the Akkadian, but of good Semitic parentage belonging to the same class, as *sêp-arik*, *arah-šamna* and others.

For *tuppu*, *tablet, badge*, see Sc. 38 = IV R. 69, 38 *tu-up-pu*, etc.; it is—in all probability—derived from a verb תָּפַף, to *beat*, to *press*, thus indicating that the tablets were pressed or beaten into their shape and form.

As regards *šikku*⁴ derived by Jensen from an Akkadian *šig* (*šeg*) = *brick*, I should say, that, if the Assyrians had adopted it from the Akkadian, they would,

⁴ The reading *šikku* with 𐎶 is confirmed by (tup) *ši-ik-ka* IV R. 55, 28, and the passage from *ZA.* iv., referred to above.

no doubt, have also adopted for its use, the sign for brick, libittu; cf. Ht. 35, 841; but tup-šikku is never, as far as I know, written with the sign for brick (šig, šeg).

To explain šikku, we must turn to V R. 32, 67 d-f; where the word occurs as an apparent synonym of ku-du-ru.⁵ Here we read as a gloss to the non-Semitic GI-EL,⁶ du-uš-su.⁷ I consider this a Semitic word equal to du-uš-šu a P'el form. from dâšu (Hebr. דָּשׁ) like uḥḥuzu *set*; ummulu; dukḫuku, kuḍdušu, etc.

We have in Hebrew a verb שָׁכַח = Arabic سَكَ = to *bow down*. Hiph'il, to *bend down*, to *overthrow a rebellion* (e. g., Num. xvii. 20), thus equivalent to דָּשׁ, to *tread down*, to *crush*.⁸ With this stem שָׁכַח I connect šikku and explain it as a form like biblu *desire*, libbu *heart*, šiddu *flank*, šikku *snake*, etc. It would thus mean *overthrow, defeat, servitude*.

Tup-šikku, then, is a compound like mûr-nišku and many others (Dg. §73) and its meaning is *tablet or badge* (indicative) of servitude, either in its literal sense or metaphorically. This meaning, etymologically established, suits all the passages examined; the (iç) allu as well as the kuduru is a tupšikku, *badge of servitude*, showing that their wearers were slaves and prisoners.⁸

Ht. 36, 880, we read si-ik⁹ = enšu *weak*. Dg. §25 explains this value as an abbreviation of siqu, *hemmed in, oppressed* = סִיק¹⁰; but in view of the fact that in Assyrian the pronunciation of š and s became gradually identical, I would rather derive sik (= šik) from sikku (= šikku).

II R. 22, 25 cd, we read šak-ku ša še'im = allu happu; BOR. iv. 47 reads šak-ku and says = שָׁקַח = שָׁכַח; šakku stands for šakiku = *crushing the corn* = allu-happu.

⁵ On kuduru see now Jastrow, *Proc. Am. Or. Soc.*, October, 1888, p. xcv. foll.

⁶ For GA-TU = EL see e. g. Ht. 23, 451 sqq.; II R. 26, 43 c.

⁷ Similar glosses abound. A few may be referred to. Ht. 73, 13a, we have (iç) zi-er-ku in the Akkadian column, borrowed from the Assyrian zirku, a *sprinkler*, זִרְקָא, a fact recognized by the genial Lenormant as early as 1876! (see *GGA.*, 1877, p. 1430-1); again Ht. 76, 1, zu-mu-ug-ga-NI from the Assyrian sanaḫu, סָנַח, Hebr. צָנַח; cf. *BAS.* i. 284, rem. 2; Dg. §25. Ht. 81, 25 kar-ra-du-um-BI = *his hero*; ZK. i. 99, §5, and Zb. 5, rem. 1. According to Professor Haupt this text (Ht. No. 10) seems to have been foolishly translated from the Assyrian into Akkadian.

⁸ See also IV R. 55, 16, where we read tup-šikku bitati ilani rabûti emedušunuti. We usually find no connecting particle u between allu and tupšikku, although all translators have inserted an "and" as if it were found so in the original texts. (iç) allu tupšikku means the *chain, the badge of servitude*, the latter standing in apposition to allu.

⁹ SIG (sik) = enešu also occurs V R. 62, 55a; cf. II R. 48, 19 gh; 28, 67 = en-šu; V 62, 57a = en-šu-us-su (= enšutšu).

¹⁰ With siqu, סִיק, usiq he *oppressed*, I connect zi-ga the ideogr. for tebû *enemy, adversary, oppressor*; also the value ik (gal) Del. Schrifttafel, 53, is of Semitic origin. In II R. 23, 62 cf. we read daltu = iḫku, a *wing of a folding door*; from this is derived the ideogr. (iç) iḫ = daltu and not (iç) gal as read usually; iḫku, of course, stands for aḫi-'u, as nimru for namiru, etc., and is derived from eḫû to *wind, to turn*.

"SONHOOD," OR ADOPTION AMONG THE EARLY BABYLONIANS.

BY THEO. G. PINCHES,

Department of Egyptian and Assyrian Antiquities, British Museum.

Among the host of dry sales of land and similar transactions, which form the subject-matter of most of the trade-documents of older Babylonia, are a few tablets of great interest to the student of ancient law in that part of the romanceful East. To these records of a long-vanished state of society, a few Assyriologists are now turning their attention; one of the most interesting papers upon the subject being Dr. Meissner's "*Die Serie ana ittišu in ihrem Verhältniss zum altbabylonischen Recht*," based partly on new acquisitions by the British Museum, and partly on the old "B." tablets (published by the Rev. J. N. Strassmaier, S. J., in the *Transactions of the Berlin Congress* in 1881), and the grammatical tablets of the Kouyunjik collection.

The more one studies the record of Babylonian private life, the more one becomes convinced, that whatever the disposition of the Assyrians may have been, the Babylonians must have been a very kind-hearted people. This kind-heartedness shows itself in many ways, but more especially, probably, in their custom of adopting children. The existence of tablets referring to this custom in later times,¹ shows that the nation did not change in this respect.

The text which I now examine has already been referred to by Dr. Meissner in the above-named article. He, however, seems not to have regarded it as a contract of adoption, but as a document illustrating the standpoint of the parents towards the children. This it does indicate indirectly—but really it is a tablet of "sonhood" (*âplûtu*). In justice, however, to my friend Dr. Meissner, I must say, that the fault of this view of the text does not lie with him, for he has done his best with the material at his command, and has excellently translated and compared the extract he has given.

The text in question is numbered B. 42 (Strassmaier 102), and is nearly complete, a few lines only at the beginning and end being broken away, and a few others damaged. The envelope, however, supplies some of the characters wanting on the tablet, and also gives some interesting variants. The language of the text is Akkadian, with a few Assyrian words and phrases here and there.

In translating a new inscription, the first thing to do is to find the "key-word,"

¹ See the *Transactions of the Society of Biblical Archaeology*, Vol. VIII., p. 275, 3d paragraph; and *HEBRAICA*, Vol. III., pp. 13-21.

so to say. The key-word, in this case, is in the second line, and is composed of the characters *nam-ibila-ni-šu* (or *-ku*), translated, in *WAI*. II. 9, 64, and 33, 7, by *ana âplûti-šu*, to *his sonhood*,—that is, *as his adopted son*. The word which follows, on our Babylonian tablet, is *ingar-**, *he made*, or *placed* (he placed as his adopted son). The general sense of these broken lines was probably to the effect that Êtel-pî-Sin had adopted Bêl-êzzu as his son. The succeeding lines read as follows:

TABLET (*ll. 3 sqq.*).

Ganâ, kirâ, marša, [NIG-GA
bîti-šu-ma(?)]
ana ig-^{*}-^{*}
ša Êtel-pî-[Sin]
ih^huz^u²
Ê[t]el-pî-Sin
hamšet âplē iraššû
Bêl-êzzu
IBILA-GI-KIME NIBAËN

The field, plantation, marša, the furniture of his house also(?)

for . . .

which Êtel-pî-Sin

possesses—

Êtel-pî-Sin

has 5 sons—

(to) Bêl-êzzu,

like a son, he will give.

ENVELOPE (*ll. 2 sqq.*).

[Ganâ], kirâ, marša, NIG-GA
bîti-šu-ma(?]
[ša] Êtel-pî-Sin
[û] Sin-naid³ âššati-šu
ih^huz^u⁴
Êtel-pî-Sin û Sin-naid
hamšet âplē eraššû⁵
Bêl-êzzu DU-NE-NE
IBILA-GI-KIME NAM NI-
BAËN

The field, plantation, marša, the furniture of his house also(?)

which Êtel-pî-Sin

and Sin-naid, his wife,

possess—

Êtel-pî-Sin and Sin-naid

have 5 sons—

(to) Bêl-êzzu, their son,

like a son, they will give a share.

From the above it will be seen, that notwithstanding that Êtel-pî-Sin had already five sons, he had no objection to adopting another, to whom, "like a son" [IBILA-GI-KIME, *son + one + like*], he gives a share (for such I take to be the meaning of NAM here) of his property. This interesting section is followed by a portion which, as Dr. Meissner says, is an exact parallel of the tablet of "Family-laws" (*WAI*. v. 25, 23-28):

² On the original *ni-du-a*.

³ As is shown by the seal-impression of Nidnat-Sin, *da* and *id* are written alike in this text; hence this reading (cf. Meissner).

⁴ On the original *ni-du-a-meš*.

⁵ Note this interesting variant form.

TABLET OF "FAMILY-LAWS."

TUKUNDI-BI DU AD-DA-
NA-RA

AD-DA-MU NU-ME-A

BA-AN-NA-AN-GU

[UMBIN MI-NI-IN-ŠA-A

GAR-RA-AŠ MI-NI-IN-DU-
E] [ŠUM⁶

ŪAZAG-GA-AŠ MI-NI-IN-

"If a son to his father

'Thou art not my father'

say,

[he shall set a mark upon him,

place him in fetters],

and sell him for silver."

B. 42, ll. 11 sqq.

7TUKUNDI-BI Bêl-êz-zu

Ê-te-el-pî-Sin-RA AD-DA-

NA

Ū Sin-na-id AMA-NI

AD-DA-MU NU-ME⁸ AMA-
MU NU-ME⁸

BA-AN-NA-GU [MU-UŠ

AZAGA-ŠU BA-AB-ŠUM-

"If Bêl-êzzu

to Êtel-pî-Sin, his father

and Sin-naid, his mother

'Thou art not my father—thou art
not my mother'

say,

they shall sell him for silver."

Notwithstanding the additional phrases on the tablet of "Family-laws," the penalty may be regarded as identical in both cases, for although it was not necessary to "set a mark on him," yet in order conveniently to sell the faithless foster-son as a slave, it would possibly be needful to put him in fetters, or, at least, to tie him up in some way, so as to prevent his escape.

The penalty for ingratitude on the part of the adopted son having been stated, the text of the tablet proceeds to deal with the foster-parents, should they, in their turn, deny their adopted son :

TABLET, ll. 17 sqq.

Ū TUKUNDI-BI

Ê-te-el-pî-Sin

Ū Sin-na-id DAM-A-NI

Bêl-êzzu DU-NI-RA

DU-MU NU-ME DIB-AN-
NA-DU-NE

GA⁷NA, GIŠ-ŠAR Ū MAR-ŠA

GA-LA-NI ŠU-BA-AB-TE-
GA

BA-AN— TUM-MU.

MU LUGALA-BI IN-PA.

"And if

Êtel-pî-Sin

and Sin-naid, his wife,

to Bêl-êzzu, their son,

cry out, 'Thou art not my son,'

field, plantation, and marša,

his property,⁹ he may take,

(and) may separate it.

He (Êtel-pî-Sin) has invoked the
spirit of the king."

⁶ See Haupt's *Sumerische Familiengesetze*.

⁷ On the case U-KUR-ŠU, "in future," precedes TUKUNDI-BI.

⁸ The envelope has NU-ME-EN in both cases, implying that the final consonant was nasal.

⁹ Meissner translates GALA by *Mitbesitz*.

This apparently means that Bêl-êzzu, the adopted son of Êtel-pî-Sin and his wife Sin-naïd, might claim and take the share of Êtel-pî-Sin's property promised to him, should Êtel-pî-Sin at any time renounce his adopted son.

Whatever the faults of the translation here given may be, the picture presented is, as far as it goes, complete, and the story hangs together consistently. We get rid, moreover, of a difficulty which must have presented itself to some minds when reading a translation of the above-named "Family Laws;" namely, how any power on earth could be supposed to dissolve the relationship between parents and their offspring, for *no son, in the sense of the word, can deny his father, any more than a father can deny his son.* They may pronounce the words of renunciation as much as they like, but their relationship remains just as it was notwithstanding. Though a father "cut off his son with a shilling," or with nothing at all, his son is still his son, and nothing can change it. Not so in a case of adoption where the law gives power of renunciation—this relationship, made by a legal form, may also be annulled by a legal form. Babylonian law was therefore in this respect more consistent than has been supposed.

Of course the result of the prevalence of this custom of adoption in Babylonia must have been to multiply lawsuits. In illustration of this the tablet B. 57, in which Ilu-banî, in order to get the property to which he claimed to be entitled, makes solemn déclaration to the effect that he was really the adopted son of Sin-magir, may be quoted as a case in point.

Girls were also adopted "to daughterhood"—or, rather (as the Babylonians were obliged to use the abstract from *mâru*), "to childship" (*mârûtu*). The only tablet known to me referring to this (B. 26) is unfortunately rather defaced. It seems to relate, however, to the adoption of a girl by a man named Tilligunu(?), but the text requires much study before a satisfactory rendering can be made.

THE SEPTUAGINT TEXT OF HOSEA COMPARED WITH THE MASSORETIC TEXT.*

BY GAYLARD H. PATTERSON, PH. D.,

New Haven, Conn.

PRELIMINARY REMARKS.

In sympathy with all earnest effort to obtain a better text of the Old Testament, I was led, at the suggestion of my esteemed friend and teacher, Professor W. R. Harper, to take up the study of the Septuagint version of Hosea. Good use has been made of the Targum by Wünsche,† and Sebök‡ has investigated the variations of the Peshitta. But the most important of the versions for textual criticism, the Septuagint, has received little attention, having been investigated only in a general way by the commentators as well as by Vollers in *Das Dodekapropheton der Alexandriner*.

It is not my purpose to repeat the history of the version, the legend of its origin, etc., since this work has already been done by those who have wider experience. The purpose is simply to compare the Septuagint with the Massoretic text and note the conclusions that may be drawn from such comparison.

The great question, however, in the study of the LXX. to-day is whether the variations, which it presents, are due to arbitrariness of translation or to difference of recension. Thus it is my object to consider whether there are variations in the translation which would not be allowed a translator, and if so, whether these are due to arbitrariness on the part of the translator or to difference of recension.

Before proceeding to the consideration of the differences between the texts, it seems best to present a brief outline of the manner in which the investigation is conducted. Having studied the text verse by verse it was my intention to present the results in somewhat the same form as is followed in the works of Lagarde, Wellhausen, Ryssel, etc., but this, it seems, fails to present to the mind any clear idea of the variations as a class. Therefore, after a brief statement in regard to the condition of the text of the LXX., the variations are considered under three general divisions which I have named *Interpretation*, *Doubtful* and *Recensional*. Under *Interpretation* those variations which may, in any fair way, be attributed to

* Part of a thesis presented to the Faculty of the Department of Philosophy and the Arts, Yale University, for the degree of Doctor of Philosophy, by Gaylard H. Patterson.

† *Der Prophet Hosea übersetzt und erklärt mit Benutzung der Targumim und der jüdischen Ausleger, Raschi, Aben Ezra und David Kimchi.* Leipzig, 1868.

‡ *Die Syrische Uebersetzung der zwölf kleinen Propheten und ihr Verhältniss zu dem massoretischen Text und zu den älteren Uebersetzungen u. s. w.* Breslau, 1887.

the translation through free translation, different punctuation, confusion of letters, etc., are considered. Under *Doubtful* cases, those variations which are of such a nature that one cannot determine whether they are due to the translator or to a difference of MSS., are considered, and under *Recensional* those cases which can only be accounted for on the supposition that the translation is based on a MS. or MSS. differing somewhat from those underlying the Massoretic text. In these divisions the material is classified as in Workman's *Text of Jeremiah*. He adopts the old terminology "in an accommodated sense." With the Massoretic text as the basis, the variations of the second and third divisions are considered under additions and omissions of letters, words, phrases, etc., "alterations of mood, tense, gender, person, number and case." Substitutions of parts of speech, syntactical forms, etc. Thus the first consideration is as to the integrity of the text of the LXX. Then those variations, which may be attributed to the translator, are considered and thus one is familiarized with the general character of the translation in such a way that he may proceed to the consideration of the doubtful and recensional cases with an additional criterion by which to estimate the value of the variations in these cases.*

The Hebrew text used in the discussion is the edition by Baer and Delitzsch; the fac-simile of the Codex Babylonicus Petropolitanus edited by H. L. Strack was also consulted. Tischendorf's sixth edition of the Septuagint is used and fac-similes of the Vatican and Alexandrian MSS. have been consulted.†

CONDITION OF THE GREEK TEXT.

With corruption in both the Hebrew and the Greek, results become very uncertain; so, while the examination of the text of the LXX. involves a special investigation of itself, a few cases of interest may be noticed here.

In 7:2 there is manifest corruption, for the reading *ὅπως συνάδωσιν ὡς ἄδοντες*—is neither Greek nor Hebrew, nor is the variant *ὅπως συνάδουσιν ὡς συνάδοντες*, better. Ewald suggests that the text may have been *ὡς συνάδοντες ἐν τῇ καρδίᾳ αὐτῶν*.‡ This might then be a free translation, or perhaps they misread יִמְרוּ for יֵאָמְרוּ. To suppose with Ewald that they read כְּמוֹ יְאוֹתוֹ בְּלִבָּב is to increase the difficulty.

In 10:6 the reading *καὶ αὐτὸν εἰς Ἀσσυρίους δέξαντες, ἀπήνεγκαν ξένια τῷ βασιλεῖ Ἰαρείμ ἐν δόματι Ἐφράϊμ δέξεται*, must be corrupt; *ξένια* and *ἐν δόματι* seem to be a double translation for the same word, though the latter may be for the Hebrew כֶּשֶׁן (?).

In 13:3 the *δακρύων* of the LXX. is probably a confusion of letters from ἀκρίδων

* Since the above divisions were made the excellent and recent work of Canon Driver has come to the writer's hands and he is pleased to find in it a very clear statement of the proper method of investigation. Cf. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*. Oxford, 1890, p. xi.

† It is gratifying to know that an excellent edition of the Greek text is now being prepared for the Syndics of the University Press, Cambridge, by H. B. Swete, D. D.

‡ *Prophecy of the Old Testament*. Vol. I., p. 273. London and Edinburgh, 1875.

which is a variant and a translation of the Hebrew consonants; *καπνοδόχης* is another variant and a good translation of the Hebrew.

In 9:10 the reading *σκοπόν ἐν συκῇ* may have arisen in some such way as is suggested by Schleusner,* viz., *σκοπόν* is a confusion of letters of the word *κ(α)ρ|πον* with *σκο|πον* and *σκ* of *σ(ν)κη*, which might then be a free translation. The parallelism establishes the Hebrew.

Instances of readings which seem to be due to the confusion or to the similarity in writing of the Greek letters are the following: The reading of the LXX. in 4:14, viz., *καὶ ὁ λαὸς ὁ συνιὼν συνεπλέκετο μετὰ πόρνης*, for which the Peshitta has *ܐܢܬܐ ܕܠܐܕܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܥܡܐ ܕܥܡܐ*, is best explained as a corruption, since the Peshitta, departing from the Massoretic text, agrees with the LXX. except that it has the negative. Compare with this 13:13, where Cyril† explains the LXX. *οὗτος ὁ υἱὸς σου ὁ φρόνιμος*, as used sarcastically; and Cappelle conjectures that *Ν7* was read *77*. But better than these is the explanation of Marck (cited by Simson), viz., *υἱὸς σου* = *υἱὸς οὐ*, *ς* having been copied a second time. In 2:16 the LXX. has *καὶ τάξω αὐτὴν ὡς ἔρημον* for *והולכתיה המדבר*. Concerning this Schleusner observes “ubi loco *τάξω* * * * reponendum videtur *ἄξω* vel *ἀνάξω* αὐτὴν εἰς ἔρημον. *ἄξω* habet quoque Cod. Basil.” These last instances as well as a conjecture of Drusius (cited by Wünsche) that *ἡμέραι* 7:5 is due to the manner of writing the dative *ΗΜΕΡΑΙ*, are sufficient to show that one must examine the ancient characters of the Greek before he can determine to what extent the manuscripts have been influenced by transcription alone. This and the evident corruption indicate that one must handle the text with great discrimination. “But fortunately in this case sound results in detail must precede and not follow the establishment of a text sound throughout.”‡

INTERPRETATION.

Under this division, as already indicated, it is proposed to consider those variations which may be attributed to the translation, whether arising directly from interpretation, or in any way due to the translator. Since the Greek translator of this book must have found difficulty in interpretation owing to the peculiarities of the style of the Prophet, this becomes one of the obstacles in the way of the textual study of the book. These peculiarities may be stated summarily as follows: brief and unconnected sentences; frequent neglect of gender, person and number; intermingling of similes and metaphors; scanty use of particles; feeble parallelism; rare words; peculiar constructions; inversions; anacolutha and corruption of text. To what extent the translation has been affected by failing to observe these peculiarities will appear in the following.

* *Novus Thesaurus in Vetus Testamentum*. Glasgow, 1822.

† J. P. Migne's edition of *Patrologia Graeca*. Paris, 1859. Vol. LXXI., p. 311.

‡ *Encyclopedia Britannica*. Article, “Septuagint” by Wellhausen. Vol. XXI., p. 669.

§ Henderson's *Commentary on the Minor Prophets*, p. 1. Andover, 1868.

I. There may be noted cases in which a word is given a meaning belonging to it, but not the proper force according to the context, as in the case of

1. Nouns, when there is used,

a. A Common Noun for a Proper Noun. *βουνός* for גבעה in 5:8; 9:9 and 10:9, influenced perhaps by 4:13 and 10:8, where the common noun occurs. The first part of the words ביתאון and ביתאל, 4:15; 5:8; 12:5, etc.,* is always translated by *οἶκος*. Other examples are σκοπία = מצפה, 5:1; *ἐψηλός* = רמה, 5:8.

b. A Proper for a Common Noun. *Ἰαρείμ* = ירב 5:13 and 10:6. Compare, however, A.V. and R.V. In this case the article would be expected with מלך. כ and ס to the mouth of an Oriental are nearly related. Cf. Ps. 16:1. For *Μάχμας* cf. p. 195.

2. Verbs; in some cases

a. A fair meaning is given. *ἀπορρίπτω* = רמה, 10:7,15; *ἐπακούω* = ענה, 2:23,24; cf. A. V., while in 5:5 and 7:10 ענה = *ταπεινώω* (עنى), etc.

b. Not in accordance with the context, as in 14:9; 2:17, where the same word is similarly translated. *ὁμοίω* = רמה, 4:5,6; *παρασιωπάω* = חרש, 10:11, 13, etc.

3. Tense. A few cases will suffice to show that the translation cannot be relied upon in expressing accurately the force of a particular tense. In 1:2 *ἐκπορνεύονσα ἐκπορνεύσει* for תִּנְה תִּנְה is a simple translation of the idiom, but fails to convey the idea in its proper force. In 2:1 *ἦ* is used for וְהִיא while the same is used for יְהִיָּה 8:6, and in 11:4 *οὐαὶ* = καὶ ἔσομαι, while אִמְשַׁכְם is translated by *ἐξέτεινα ἀντοῖς*, etc. Even upon superficial examination one discovers the inaccuracy of the translation in this particular. But when it is remembered that interpreters still disagree as to the force of the "Perfect" and "Imperfect" in particular cases, one is not surprised to find that the "present perfect," the "frequentative imperfect," etc., are not properly rendered. Such nice shades of expression cannot be expected in the translation. On the contrary it is just the slavishness of the translation that makes it possible to reconstruct the Hebrew text from it. No one would attempt it from a modern translation.

4. Government. There are cases in which the government or construction of a phrase or sentence is not exact as when

a. A verb is read transitively with an object when it should be intransitive, as *καὶ αἵματα ἐφ' αἵμασι μίσχονσι* for וְדָמִים בְּדָמִים נָגְעוּ 4:2; *ἐμέρισαν καρδίας αὐτῶν* for חֶלֶק לָבָם 10:2; *ἀπέστρεψε τὴν ὁργὴν μου* for שָׁב אָפִי 14:5, etc. Compare also 13:15b, where, however, they may have pointed the verbs differently,

b. Which may also be the case in certain active verbs which are read passively, as in 12:11 *ἀρμή* = *ὁμοιώθη*; 5:7 *יֵלֶר* = *ἐγεννήθησαν*(?), etc.

* When etc. occurs, a few unimportant cases are not cited since the cases under this division are cited simply to set forth the general character of the translation; otherwise the treatment is exhaustive.

c. The subject and object of the verb are also sometimes confused. In 4:11 this affects the entire verse.

II. As indicated, some of the above variations may have arisen from a different pointing. To this cause many variations may be attributed and in some cases the LXX. reading is to be preferred. Sometimes the change is

1. A Noun for a Verbal Form.

דָּבַר for **דִּבֶּר** 1:2, also for **דָּבַר** 13:1. The Massoretic text gives a fair construction in Hebrew, and being the more difficult is to be preferred; it also gives a very good sense. The Peshitta and Targum, however, have the noun. **אֲשׁוּר** = **אֲשׁוּר** 13:7. So also the Peshitta **אֲשׁוּר** and Vulgate, "in via Assyriorum," and Hitzig.* **רָעָה** (adj.) = **רָעָה** 12:2 and **יִקְרָאוּהוּ** = **יִקְרָאוּהוּ** 11:7 wrongly, as also **וַיִּכְחַד** for **וַיִּכְחַדְוּ** 6:9, and though in 4:19 **צָרָה** for **צָרָה** is adopted by Drake,† the sense and context are better sustained by the Massoretic text.

2. Verbal Form for Noun.

פָּרָא = **פָּרָא** 8:9, but this is contrary to the 8th verse. **שָׁנְבִים** = **שָׁנְבִים** 8:6, wrongly, as also **לִפְתָּח** for **לִפְתָּח** 2:17. In 12:6 **יָהִיָּה** for **יָהִיָּה** occurs the more easily, as **יָהִיָּה** occurs in the preceding.

3. Verbal Form for Verbal Form.

In 3:1 **רָעָה** = **רָעָה**. Drake assumes this without doubt to be the true reading. Hermann‡ also adopts it, explaining the arrangement, however, as chiasitic. The ordinary reading is adopted by all the later commentators, but it seems that a slight variation from the LXX. and Massoretic text, reading **רָעָה** after J. D. Michaelis,§ gives a better parallelism as well as uniformity in the use of the participles. The first two, thus, refer to the evil habits of the woman in relation to her *paramour* and the consequent adultery, while the next couplet refers to Israel's relation to "other gods" and the consequent idolatrous practice, indicated in the expression "love cakes of grapes." Thus it is the waywardness of the woman not the decoymment of idols that is censured.

In 7:5 **הִחֲלֹה** for **הִחֲלֹה**, not badly. Several other cases, however, are not so good, as: **הִשְׁבַּתִּי** = **הִשְׁבַּתִּי** 2:13; **שֵׁת קֶצֶר** = **שֵׁת קֶצֶר** 6:11; **יִרְדְּפוּ** = **יִרְדְּפוּ** 8:3; **יִתְּנוּ** = **יִתְּנוּ** 8:10; **רָטְשָׁה** = **רָטְשָׁה** 10:14; **יִרְחֹם** = **יִרְחֹם** 14:4; **הִשְׁבַּתִּים** = **הִשְׁבַּתִּים** 11:11; **יִלְדוּ** = **יִלְדוּ** 5:7.

4. A Noun for a Noun.

מִשְׁבַּת = **מִשְׁבַּת** 14:5; cf. 11:7, but wrongly as also **אֶן** = **אֶן** 12:4, perhaps a free translation here. **אֲחִיכֶם** = **אֲחִיכֶם** 2:3; (?) **אֲחֻתֵּיכֶם** = **אֲחֻתֵּיכֶם** 2:3; (?) **צִלָּה** = **צִלָּה** 4:13; **צִאֲנִים** = **צִאֲנִים** 5:6; **בְּקָרִים** = **בְּקָרִים** 5:6; **עֹלָתָהּ** = **עֹלָתָהּ** 10:13.

* *Die zwölf kleinen Propheten.* Leipzig, 2d edition, 1852, p. 56.

† *Notes on Jonah and Hosea.* Cambridge, 1853, p. 98.

‡ *Studien und Kritiken*, 1879, p. 515.

§ *Deutsche Uebersetzung des Alten Testaments.* Vol. XI. Goettingen, 1782, pp. 4 and 21.

5. Other Cases. עַם for עָם 12:1 ; מִים = מַיִם 11:10 ; (?) אֵין = אֵין 12:12. These and other cases are noted under other heads. Cf. VIII., pp. 201 sq.

III. There is also a number of variations arising from a different arrangement and construction of the text, consisting in

1. The different grouping of words, affecting

a. A change in a verse, as 4:5 לִילָהּ וְרַמְתִּי אִמִּי = νυκτὶ ὁμοίωσα τὴν μητέρα σου. Vulgate, "Nocte tacere feci matrem tuam." The connective ׀ probably did not occur in the MSS. from which these translations were made. The parallelism and contrast between day and night favor the Massoretic text. In 9:6 the LXX., ἐκ ταλαιπωρίας Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἐκδέξεται αὐτοὺς Μέμφις, καὶ θάψει αὐτοὺς Μαχμάς κ.τ.λ., misses the sense perhaps because of the general expression preceding מִצְרַיִם and the subject standing first; while the incorrect reading of מחמר also conduced to this. Jerome* thought they confused ׀ and ׀. Μάχμας is elsewhere the translation of מִכְמִישׁ and so associating this with Egypt they have misread here.

In 9:4, וְלֹא יַעֲרְבוּ-לוֹ זְבַחֵיהֶם כִּלְחָם אוֹנִים לָהֶם = LXX., καὶ οὐχ ἡδύναν αὐτῶν αἱ θυσίαι αὐτῶν ὡς ἄρτος πένθους, κ.τ.λ. Variant, ἡδύναντο κ.τ.λ. Peshitta, וְלֹא יִתְקַבְּלוּן לְרַעְוָא קוֹרְבָנֵיהוֹן. Targum, וְלֹא יִתְקַבְּלוּן לְרַעְוָא קוֹרְבָנֵיהוֹן. The one reading of the LXX. as well as the Peshitta and Targum take זְבַחֵיהֶם as the subject of the verb, giving the better construction. The variant of the LXX. has in its favor also the fact that ἡδύνω when used actively takes the accusative. Cheyne suggests that the Massoretic division "was possibly caused by a wish to preclude a misinterpretation of Hosea's language, viz., that the Israelites would go on sacrificing to Jehovah even when in captivity."† Other cases may be found in 9:11; 11:8; 12:1,2,3; 13:2 and 14:8; they need no comments.

b. A change in more than one verse, as in 4:14,15: יִלְכֹּט: אִם-זֶנֶה אֶתָּה. LXX.—συνεπλέκετο μετὰ πόρνῃς. Σν. Here the LXX. seem to have tried to bring the last of the verse into consonance with the phrase עַם הַזֹּנוֹת יַרְדּוּ, and thus translate freely, reading עַם for אִם a very easy confusion. Sebök, however, suggests that the LXX. which he thinks the Peshitta followed, deluded by the sound of the letters, translated יִלְכֹּט, but this does not seem well supported by his references. At any rate a glance at the text shows it to be incorrectly construed.

In 9:8,9 for "הָעַמִּיקוּ שְׁחַתוּ כִּימֵי יְגוֹ" the LXX. has μανίαν ἐν δίκῃ θεοῦ κατέπηξαν, ἐφθάρησαν κ.τ.λ. The two verbs coming together in the Hebrew were separated by the translator and the first was given to the preceding clause. The Massoretic text, however, gives a possible construction and being the more difficult is to be preferred. Other cases may be found in 4:11,12; 5:15 and 6:1, also 6:10,11.

2. The different grouping of letters, as in 4:4, where: וְעַמָּה כְּמִרְיָ כְהֵן =

* *Patrologia Latina*, Ed. J. P. Migne, Paris, 1845. Vol. XXV., p. 894.

† *The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges. Hosea.* Cambridge, 1887, p. 94.

LXX. ὁ δὲ λαὸς μου ὡς ἀντιλεγόμενος ἱερεὺς. The LXX. reading suits the context better in placing כ so as to read עמי, cf. v. 6. The כ in the Massoretic text is probably from the first of the following word, and so this case might have been considered under *Recensional* variations, but being connected with an otherwise free translation it seemed best to consider both under *Interpretation*. The translation of the latter part may be thought to invalidate that of the first part, but the final Yôdh of כמרי was probably obscured in the MS., and thus this would be a fair translation following closely the order of the words, since in Greek the regular order would be the reverse. Thus the LXX. becomes a safeguard against such conjectures as that of Wellhausen* unless such corruption took place before the translation was made. One conjecture by Robertson Smith,† viz., כמרי בי, is antedated by a conjecture cited by Rosenmüller,‡ viz., “Quos conjecturae juvant, miror, in eam pariter non incidisse, qua legeretur כי כמרי cum affixo primae pers. singul. sicut contendens adversus me sacerdos, ita ut sensus exoriretur periodi; tum populus tuus tum sacerdos mihi contradicunt et adversantur. ‘Si genuina floret lectio in Alexandrina versione, videri haec posset isti conjecturae ex parte faveri.’”§

In 6:5 for יצא ומשפטיך אור יצא the LXX. has καὶ τὸ κρίμα μου ὡς φῶς ἐξελεύσεται; the Peshitta, ܡܫܦܬܝܟܐ ܕܝܫܐ ܕܡܝܬܐ ܕܝܫܐ; the Targum, וְדִינִי כְּנֹהָר נֶפֶק. These versions surely give the better reading here, not involving a change of person nor the necessity of supplying, as the Massoretic text does. As is evident, this simply requires the כ to be joined to the following word; it is favored by Cheyne and others.

Other cases are the following: For רבו תורתִי, 8:12, the translation in the LXX. is πλῆθος, καὶ τὰ νόμιμα αὐτοῦ κ.τ.λ. = רב ותורתו. In 7:11 for מצרים קראו the LXX. has Αἰγυπτὸν ἑπεκαλεῖτο, καὶ εἰς Ἀσσυρίους κ.τ.λ. = מצרים קרא ואשור וגו'. In 11:2 for מפניהם the LXX. is ἐκ προσώπου μου αὐτοὶ. נמצאו = מצאו, 6:2,3. Cf. also p. 200 for 7:1.

IV. The character of the languages being so different, allowance must be made for certain variations due to the genius of each language; as in the case of

1. Asyndeton, which occurs much more frequently in Hebrew than in Greek. Cf. 1:1; 3:1, etc.
2. Verbal Apposition, when the second verb is often translated by an infinitive. Cf. 1:6; 5:11, etc.
3. Abstract Plurals, which are usually well translated by the singular, as in 1:2, אֵשֶׁת יְנוּנִים = γυναικα πορνείας. Cf. also 2:4,6; 5:4, etc.
4. Collectives, which are often translated by the plural, as in 2:20, where the

* *History of Israel*. Edinburgh, 1885, p. 138.

† *The Prophets of Israel*. New York, 1882, p. 406.

‡ *Scholia in Vetus Testamentum*. Leipzig, 1812. VII., 1, p. 124.

§ *Dissertationes Aurivillii*. Goettingae et Lipsiae, 1790, p. 606.

Hebrew עַם חַיַּת הַשָּׂדֶה = μετὰ τῶν θηρίων τοῦ ἀγροῦ. So also the other collectives of the verse and elsewhere. Some cases are more doubtful, as ἀμαρτίας for חַמָּאת 4:8; εὐφραναν βασιλεῖς = יִשְׂמְחוּ-מֶלֶךְ 7:8.

5. Infinitives, as in 4:2, where the infinitives are translated by nouns, representing the sense fairly. However, the translator may have vocalized the words as nouns; the stronger expression is given in the received text.

6. Peculiarities.

a. In the translation of רַחֲמָה 1:6, etc., it cannot be determined whether the translator read מְרַחֲמָה a participle, or a perfect רַחֲמָה, since he would probably translate in the same way in either case. Thus the translation seldom gives any light on such forms.

b. In a western language the expression "their souls" is preferable to "their soul," but such an expression is quite common in Hebrew. In 4:8 for the Hebrew נַפְשׁוֹ the LXX. has τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν, reading נַפְשָׁם perhaps, as do many Hebrew MSS., or they may have referred the singular suffix to the community and thus translated in the plural; in either case the effect upon the noun is the same, requiring the plural. Cf. also 9:11, כְּבוֹדָם = αἱ δόξαι αὐτῶν; 13:8, לֶבָם = καρδίας αὐτῶν, etc.

c. In the Greek a part of speech frequently carries its force farther than in the Hebrew, and so where it would be repeated in Hebrew the one answers in Greek. Such is the case in 5:6, where בְּצִאֲנָם וּבִבְקָרָם = μετὰ προβάτων καὶ μύσχων. Note also the translation of מִיד שְׁאוֹל אֶפְרַם מִמּוֹת אֲנָאֵל 13:14, viz., ἐκ χειρὸς ἄδου ῥύσσομαι καὶ ἐκ θανάτου λυτρώσομαι αὐτούς. Variant αὐτούς for καὶ.

d. Frequently the term אֲשׁוּר is translated as referring to the inhabitants, as in 7:11, etc.

e. Other Cases. In 2:23 אֶעֱנֶה אֶת-הַשָּׁמַיִם וְהֵם = ἐπακούσομαι τῷ ὀφρανῷ, καὶ αὐτός. In 5:1 שְׁמַעוּ-זֹאת = Ἀκούσατε ταῦτα.

V. Some minor variations may also be explained as free translations and may easily be detected. Such are the following:

1. Those which may be said to give the sense of what is expressed figuratively in Hebrew, as in 2:7, where for צִמְרִי וּפִשְׁתִּי the LXX. τὰ ἱμάτιά μου καὶ τὰ ὀσθονία μου, gives the article for the material of which it is made and this is not far from the Hebrew. Cf. Lev. 13:47, where בָּגֶד occurs with these words; cf. also 2:11. The translation of the last word of the verse, שְׁקוּי, by πάντα ὅσα μοι καθήκει represents the idea of the Hebrew in a general expression. In 2:17 כְּרַמִּיהַ = τὰ κτήματα αὐτῆς, "which," as Simson observes, "is perhaps not to be emended to κλήματα with Drusius, but explains itself from the peculiarity of the LXX., in the use of synecdoche, preferring to place the genus for the species."*

2. In many places יוֹם seems to have been taken in a general sense and is translated by the plural. Cf. 4:6; 5:9; 7:5; 10:14, etc.

* *Der Prophet Hosea.* Hamburg und Gotha, 1851, p. 101.

3. There are also some cases in which the translator seems to have given a peculiar meaning to a form by reference to the root from which the word is derived, as in 2:17, where for **לִפְתֹּחַ תִּקְוָה** the LXX. has *διανοίξαι σύνεσιν αὐτῆς*, pointing the first as an infinitive, which, with the ordinary meaning of **תִּקְוָה**, does not make good sense; but the translation is not so remote as to require the conjecture that they read **תִּקְנָה** (Drusius). The words in their first meanings are not so far apart as they seem to be, **קָוָה** meaning "to bind" and *σύνεσις* (*συνήμι*) "a joining together," so that though **תִּקְוָה** is not translated elsewhere by this word, it seems probable that it is the form which was before the translator. The vocalization, however, may have been **תִּקְוָה** as Sebök suggests. The LXX. take this verse as one of warning and so the translation of this phrase is more in accordance with the context as thus understood. In 5:12 **עֵשׂ** is translated by *παραχῆ* and the root from which **עֵשׂ** is derived is frequently translated by *παράσσω*, so that, though the exact meaning is not given here, the translator's intention is shown to be right.

4. There are other cases in which the meaning given a word or form is inexact, as in 1:6, where *ἀντιτασσόμενος ἀντιτάξομαι* for **נִשָּׂא אִשָּׁה** does not seem so strange when one thinks of the different interpretations that have been given this clause by the commentators. Wünsche and Nowack say this translation demands the *Hithpāl*, but it is to be remembered that the translator must not be held responsible for modern knowledge of grammar; moreover such translation nowhere occurs for the *Hithpāl*. It is also to be noted that the same words occur in 1 Kgs. 11:34 for **נִשָּׂא אִשָּׁתוֹ**, from which Schleusner conjectured that the translator read the same here. However, the emphatic infinitive construction points to the form here as the basis, and if the translations are in any way related then it seems probable that the translator of Kings read **נִשָּׂא אִשָּׁאוֹ** which only involves the change of a **ת** to an **א**; not a difficult change with the old Hebrew characters. Though the translation itself cannot be supported, it is interesting in that it shows an attempt to translate the form which occurs in the received text. Moreover the influence of **כִּי** preceded by a negative perhaps had some force in affecting the translation. In this case it may be compared with that of the A. V. In 2:15 the LXX. has *ἐν αἷς ἐπέθην αὐτοῖς* for **אִשֶּׁר לָהֶם תִּקְטִיר לָהֶם**, referring **אִשֶּׁר**, with **בָּם** omitted, to **יָמֵי**, to which Hitzig refers it also, since otherwise the latter part of the verse requires some additional explanation. Nowack takes **אִשֶּׁר** as an accusative of time. There is no reason for supposing that the translator* found **בָּם** in the MS.* used. In 3:2 the translation of **אִכְרִיָּה** by *ἐμισθωσάμενη* is probably based on the same text. Cf. the Arabic **كِر** in the eighth form. However, the translator may have referred it to **שָׂכַר**.

* The singular, *translator*, should not be taken as implying that the translation was made by one person, since this is not known, but it is used for sake of convenience. MS. is used in the same way.

In the difficult figurative language of 7:4sq. the translator seems to have found some difficulty, but has given the words fairly, though missing the sense. כלם is translated by πάντες, either dropping ם on account of the same letter following, or probably it is used as expressing the meaning. (Cf. v. 7): κατακάματος for יִשְׁבוֹת seems to have been taken as referring to the fire and thus the sense is missed. In v. 5 λοιμός for לִצִּין does not give the exact meaning of the word, but it is frequently used for לִץ. In v. 6 ἀνεκαύθησαν for קָרְבוֹ does not require the conjectures that the reading was חָרַב (Cappelle), קָדַח (Buxtorf), etc. The sense seems to have been adapted to the figure. The translation of אָרַב by καταράσσω is free also. Cf. the translation of אָרַב by καταρρέω in 1 Sam. 2:35.

In 12:7 the LXX. ἐγγύς for קִנְיָה is probably a free translation. Though the phrase קָרַב אֶל to which the translation corresponds is one of frequent occurrence, Ezek. 40:46; 1 Sam. 14:36, etc., the other is also, as in Ps. 37:34; 27:14, and suits the following תִּקְמִיד better.

In 5:8 several words are rendered freely, as may be seen by a reference to the text, but the idea is conveyed; such is the case also in 8:4, but the idea in המְלִיכֹו and השִׁירֹו is not so well expressed. Other cases of free translation are the following: יֹאסֵפוֹ = ἐκλείψουσιν, 4:3; יִפְרָצוּ = κατεσθύνωσι, 4:10; אֹמִיר = θήσομαι, 4:7; סָרַר סָרָה = παροιστῶσα κ.τ.λ., 4:16; נִבְחַר = ἀπέστη, 5:3; בִּיהוּה בָּגְרוּ = ὅτι τὸν κύριον ἐγκατέλειπον, 5:7; לַחֲבָה = φέγγος, 7:6; וְזָקָה בּוֹ = ἐξήνθησαν αὐτῷ, 7:9; נֶאֱמָנָה = πιστά (אַמְנוּנָה), 5:9; יִקְמְנוּ = ἐξαναστησόμεθα (?), 6:2; רוּחַ = ἀνεμόφθορα, 8:7; קִימוֹשׁ = ὀλεθρος, 9:6; הִבָּה = ἐβόνησεν, 9:16; אֲמַנְךָ = ὑπερασπιῶ (מָגֵן ?), 11:8; תִּלְאֲבוֹת = οὐκλήτω, 13:5; שָׁחַל = πανθήρ,* 13:7; etc.

VI. There are some variations which appear to be slight turns given to expressions for the sake of clearness or interpretation. They are cases which, if retranslated into Hebrew, would require,

1. An alteration or substitution, as in 4:3, where for the Hebrew וְאִמְלֵל וְאִשְׁבֵּה בָהּ כָּל-יֹשְׁבֵי בָהּ the LXX. is καὶ σμικρυνθήσεται ὅν πᾶσι τοῖς κατοικοῦσιν αὐτήν. The verb being taken as passive it was easiest to refer it to the land, and thus כל יושב בה is construed, as the following words, with ב. In 4:12 the force of ב in the first clause is either carried over to the second or the translator supposed the second should agree, reading וּבְמִקְלוֹ, but this does not suit here. In 9:8,17 the suffixes are not translated, but in the connection the general term אֱלֹהִים seems to have been preferred, though the translator probably found אֱלֹהֵי in the MS. If the Greek καὶ τάξω αὐτὴν ὡς ἔρημον, 2:16, is original this is a turn in expression, but see p. 192. Cf. also שִׁבְלֵתִים = ἀτεκνωθήσονται, 9:12; שָׂר לָהֶם = δέλαιοι εἰσιν, 7:13.

2. An addition, as in 2:10, where, for the Hebrew וְכִסָּף חֲרִבִּיתִי לֵה וְהֵב עִשׂוֹ, the LXX. is καὶ ἀργύριον ἐπλήθυνα αὐτήν. αὐτὴ δὲ ἀργυρᾶ καὶ χρυσᾶ ἐποίησε, which seems to have been caused by the peculiarity of the arrangement of the Hebrew.

* Modern interpreters also find difficulty in translating the Hebrew words for lion.

There is an attempt to convey the idea. But are the people represented as using silver which God had given and gold which he had not given?

In 3:3, if *ἐτέρω* was in the original it is a wrong interpretation, but some editions do not have it,* and it is probably a correction.

In 4:2, misled by taking the infinitives as nouns, the translator makes these the subject of the verb **פָּרָצוּ** which is translated *κέχυται ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς*, retaining the image of the breaking forth of water, as also the Vulgate in “inundaverunt,” and this probably explains the addition; though it may be a copyist’s error, being repeated from the preceding verse.

In 7:1 for the Hebrew **וּגְנַב יָבֹא פֶשֶׁט גְּרוֹד בַּחוּץ** the LXX. has *καὶ κλέπτῃς πρὸς αὐτὸν εἰσελεύσεται, ἐκδύσκων ληστῆς ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ αὐτοῦ*. The addition arose perhaps from carrying out **בָּא** more fully than the verb alone does. (Cf. 9:4, where the preposition is added to convey the idea.) The variation in the last is suggested by the preceding, but the initial **ו** of the following verse was no doubt read as a suffix to **בַּחוּץ**.

In 5:11 the Hebrew **עָשׂוּק אֶפְרַיִם** seems to have been too general an expression for the translator, and the vowel letters not being in the MSS.† perhaps he took this form as well as the following **רָצוּן** as active and supplied the object for the first. Similarly **וַיִּשְׁלַח**, 5:13, is not expressed in Greek without an object as easily as in Hebrew, so *πρέσβεις* is supplied as an object in Greek.

Other cases may be seen in the following: **אֵלֶּה** = *δένδρον συσκιάζοντος*, 4:13; **לְבָיָא** = *σκύμνοι ὀρνυμοῦ*, 13:8; **רַעֲנָן** = *πυκάζουσα*, 14:9; **הַשְּׁלֵם** = *ἀνταποδόσεώς σου* (?), 9:7; variant, *ἀνταπαδόσεως*; **אֶהְבֶּהָ** = *ἀγαπήσεώς μου*, 11:4; etc.

VII. There are some cases in which the translator has missed the sense through a false construction or misunderstanding of a word, etc. There may be noted,

1. The misunderstanding of words and incorrect reading of suffixes often connected with such misunderstanding, as in 2:18, where **בַּעֲלִי** = *βααλείμ*. This probably arose out of a difficulty in the mind of the translator in not understanding how Yahweh could ever have been called **בַּעַל**, or an unwillingness to admit it.

In 13:14 **דִּבְרֶיךָ** = *δίκη σου*, referring to the singular **דָּבָר** rather than to **דְּבָרִים**.

In 11:1 for the Hebrew **לְבָנֵי** the LXX. is *τὰ τέκνα αὐτοῦ*, referring by the suffix to Israel probably, but this would be *their fathers*. Cf. Mt. 2:15. Note also the suffixes of the first for the third person in 12:5.

In 7:16 **רָמִיָּה** = *ἐντεταμένον*, cf. Jer. 4:29; **כַּשְׁלָת** = *ἀσθενήσει*, 4:5; **כַּשְׁלָת** = *ἡσθένησαν*, 14:2; **הוֹדִי** = *κατάκαρπος*, 14:7.

* Field’s *Hexapla*. Oxford, 1875. Vol. II., p. 944.

† The “plena scriptio” probably was not common in the MSS. which the translators used. Cf. *Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel*, p. xxxii.

2. Wrong Constructions. Closely connected with the preceding is the misunderstanding of the word כמרי, 10:5, for which the LXX. reads καθὼς παρεπύκρναν αὐτόν, deriving it from מרה with כ, but this construction requires כאשר. The uncommon word seems to have caused difficulty.

In 2:19 for וְלֹא יִזְכְּרוּ עוֹד בְּשִׁמְם the LXX. is καὶ οὐ μὴ μνησθῶσιν οὐκ ἔτι τὰ ὀνόματα αὐτῶν, taking כ in construction with the verb and translating as in the Hiph'il. Cf. Josh. 23:7; Isa. 48:1. Perhaps they vocalized as Hiph'il, but יִזְכְּרוּ seems well sustained. Cf. Zech. 13:2.

In 6:5 for חֲצַבְתִּי בְּנִבְיָאִים the LXX. has ἀπεθέρισα τοὺς προφῆτας ὑμῶν. No object being expressed for the verb the phrase was probably taken in the sense of "slaying in" or "among the prophets" and read בְּנִבְיָאִים. The received text and interpretation are sustained by the parallelism.

In 11:6 for וְחָלָה חֲרֵב בְּעָרָיו וְכִלְתָּה בָּרָיו the LXX. has καὶ ἡσθένησεν ἐν ῥομφαίᾳ ἐν ταῖς πόλεσιν αὐτοῦ, καὶ κατέπανσεν ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ. The first verb is derived from חלה and both it and כלה are taken intransitively, while בָּרָיו is made to correspond with בְּעָרָיו in the first clause and so is read בִּירֵיו. The translator seems to have been influenced by an attempt to bring out parallelism.

In 9:1 אֵל גִּיל is translated in the LXX. by μηδὲ εὐφραίνου; in the Vulgate, "noli exultare." The early translators probably overlooked the fact that אֵל is not thus used. They may have read אֵל תְּגִיל, but cf. Job 3:22, which favors the received text.

In 7:14 the LXX. makes לֵבָם the subject of the verb in the translation καὶ οὐκ ἐβόησαν πρὸς μὲ αἱ καρδίαι αὐτῶν, for the Hebrew וְלֹא זָעְקוּ אֵלַי בְּלִבָּם.

In 6:7 וְהָמָּה כֹּאדָם עֲבָרוּ, the translation of which is αὐτοὶ δὲ εἰσιν ὡς ἀνθρώπος παραζώνων. עֲבָרוּ is read עָבַר, qualifying כֹּאדָם. This is a weak statement, but perhaps not more so than one interpretation of 4:4, viz., "thy people are as they that strive with the priest," or the expression in 5:10.

In 6:8 קְרִית פְּעִלִי אֵין = πόλις ἐργαζομένη μάταια; בְּעַמִּים הוּא = ἐν τοῖς λαοῖς αὐτοῦ (annexion?), 7:8; וְלִפְקוֹד = τοῦ ἐκδικῆσαι, 12:3.

VIII. Again, there are some variations which seem to have arisen through the peculiar difficulty presented by the Hebrew or the MSS., or a strange misunderstanding of the text. In many cases a combination of these causes explains a reading. Since the reason for a variation of this nature is not very evident they need not be classified more definitely. The following are instances of such variation:

In 2:4 for the Hebrew וְתָסַר זִנוּנִיהָ מִפְּנֶיהָ (v. 5 וְתָסַר זִנוּנִיהָ מִפְּנֵי אִשְׁתָּהּ), the LXX. reads καὶ ἐξαρῶ τὴν πορνείαν αὐτῆς ἐκ προσώπου μου (v. 5 ὅπως ἂν ἐκδύσω αὐτήν). Perhaps the first person is used as anticipative of the same in the following verse. Though the sense is missed, the translation does not involve any important change in the

text. **מפניה** for **תסר**; and **מפני** for **אסר**, the former being much more common would naturally be taken in case of obscurity. **פן** in v. 5 was perhaps read **כי** unless the Greek should read *ὅπως μή* (?). Cf. p. 192.

In 12:15 for the Hebrew **הכעים אפרים תמרורים** the LXX. has *ἐθύμωσεν Ἐφραΐμ καὶ παρώργισε*; variant, insert *ἐν* before *Ἐφραΐμ*. Is this an attempt to render the phrase by the combination of two verbs or was one originally an adverb in force, but altered? The second verb of the Greek is the one most frequently used for **כעס**, but the other is also used. There must be an alteration or corruption here, perhaps a double rendering.

In 14:8 it is suggested that the LXX. *ζήσονται καὶ μεθυθήσονται σίτω*, is a double translation of **יִחְיוּ דָגַן**, being read once **יִחְיוּ**, once **יִרְוּ**, to which *μεθυθήσονται* corresponds, but this word with *σίτος* is unparalleled. This is probably to be traced to a tampering with the text of the LXX. Such "conflate readings" are probably rightly attributed to admixture from other versions. According to the following canon, "If two readings coexist, of which one expresses the Massoretic text, while the other can only be explained from a text deviating from it, the latter is to be regarded as the original,"* *μεθυθήσονται σίτω* should be regarded as the original reading. This then may be a free translation of **יִרְוּ דָגַן**, which would not be bad in this connection.

In 14:3 **כָּל-תִּשְׂאָה** = *ὅπως μὴ λάβητε*. In the unparalleled Hebrew the translator seems to have found difficulty, reading **כִּי לֵיא** perhaps for **כָּל**. The difficulty of the expression baffles the modern interpreter also.

In 12:1 for the Hebrew **עַד רַר עַם אֵל וְעַם קְרוּשִׁים נֶאֱמַר** the LXX. has *νῦν ἔγνω αὐτοὺς ὁ θεὸς καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἅγιος κεκλήσεται*, mistaking blame for praise, but such a sentiment in this connection is altogether out of place. A slight change of consonants and pointing would admit the Greek reading, viz., **עַתָּה? יָדַעַם אֵל**.

Other cases in which a slight change will admit a peculiar reading are the following: 6:9 altered to "**כְּחֶךְ אִישׁ נְרֹדוֹרִים** (**הַחֲבִיאֵו וְגֹרֹ**)" may explain the LXX. *καὶ ἡ ἰσχὺς σου ἀνδρὸς πειρατοῦ ἐκρυψαν κ.τ.λ.*; also 11:7, **וְאֵל עַל יִקְרִיו יָחַר**,† for which the LXX. is *καὶ ὁ θεὸς ἐπὶ τὰ τίμα αὐτοῦ θυμωθήσεται*. 12:12 again, **אִם-נִלְעַד אֵין בְּנִלְעַד שְׂרִים** for the LXX. *εἰ μή Γαλαὰδ ἐστιν... ἐν Γαλαὰδ ἄρχοντες*. With 8:9, *δῶρα ἡγάπησαν* compare **אֶהְבֵּת אֶתְנֵן**, 9:1. The translator has not used **תִּנָּה** anywhere; at least no translation requires it. 13:1, **רַתָּה** = *δικαιώματα*, perhaps for **רַת**. Aramaic(?). In 8:7 **כִּלִּי** seems to have been omitted. *θυσιαστήρια τὰ ἡγαπημένα*, 8:12, repeated from 8:11 by copyist? In 2:8 **וְגִרְתִּי אַתָּה** **וְגִרְרָה** = *καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσω τὰς ὁδοὺς*, free?

* Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel, p. xlvii.

† Not **וְאֵל** after Simson and Wünsche, as Nowack indicates.

IX. Another reason for variation in the translation is the confusion of consonants; these must often have been dim and obscure in ancient MSS. Moreover the similarity between some of the letters must have led to confusion. The MSS. used by the translator were probably written in the old Hebrew or "square" characters, and the letters may have been confused in the transmission of those MSS. before the translation was made. Hence it is difficult to determine, many times, whether the translator erred in reading these, or some copyist before him. It seems probable, however, that as good a MS. or MSS. as the average would be used in such a translation, and accordingly the following variations may fairly be considered as due to the translator.

In 1:4 for יהוא the LXX. has Ἰούδα. Jerome believed this to have been due to the inexperience of the translator, using this word because it was the more common. Simson also points out the fact that "Judah" is thus brought into consonance with "house of Israel" at the end of the verse. יהודה might also be confused easily with יהוא, especially the apocopated form יהור. Thus in case of obscurity Judah would naturally be taken. But we, thinking of a definite fact, find that the context requires יהוא.

Instead of ליער (2:14) the LXX. has εἰς μαρτύριον, concerning which Jerome observed, "LXX. posuerunt testimonium, Reš et Daleth literarum falsi similitudine." This seems probable, since Yôdh (י) might easily be obliterated.

In 10:14 for בֵּית אֲרַבָּאֵל the LXX. has ἐκ τοῦ οἴκου τοῦ Ἱεροβοάμ; variant, Ἱεροβαάλ. The latter reading is that of the Alex. and Sin. MSS.; it is also the one Jerome gives for the reading of the LXX. It would seem then that אֲרַבָּאֵל was read אֲרַבָּאֵל through confusion of א and י, perhaps also א and ע, while בֵּית was translated. Possibly a confusion of Zalmunna with שִׁלְמָן may have led to the peculiar reading here, referring to Jerubaal, mentioned in the same passage, viz., Judg. 8. Jerome endeavored to explain the reading from this, but the reference is to a place, not to a person. The passage in the Hebrew awaits a satisfactory explanation.

In 4:12 כִּי רוּחַ = πνεῦμα of the LXX. The reading was probably כִּי for כִּי and this the more readily since הַתְּעָה is without an object, unless the reading was הַתְּעָה as in some MSS.,* and is translated freely.

In 10:2; 5:15 and 14:1 אִשָּׁם is translated by ἀφανίζω. The translator probably read אִשָּׁם. Cf. 2:12 and 5:9, where the forms from אִשָּׁם are translated by derivatives of ἀφανίζω. It is possible, however, that the translator may have connected these two roots in some such way as Schmoller, whose opinion was that from the idea of suffering punishment comes the idea of being desolated, waste.

* Davidson's *Hebrew Text*. London. P. 123.

In 7:6 for אָפּהם the LXX. has Ἐφραίμ, which is not easy to explain unless the reading of the MS. was אֶפְיָהם and this was confused with the form אֶפְרַיִם in some way. Perhaps the left foot of ה was obliterated and then the remaining form and Yôdh were transposed, or ה may have been read for י, since these letters were sometimes confused in the old characters.* Compare also מִים for מָדָם, 6:8.

In 11:4 the LXX. has ὡς ἡπαίρων ἀνθρώπος ἐπὶ τὰς διαγόνδας αὐτοῦ for the Hebrew כְּמִרְמֵי עַל לְחֵיָהֶם, reading כְּמִרְט עַל and omitting one עַל: this is taken as a threat; cf. Isa. 50:6. The context shows it to be wrong. Ἀνθρώπος is used indefinitely, as several times.

In 8:6 ἐν τῷ Ἰσραήλ arose probably from confusing כִּי with כ and thus ׀ would seem a repetition or was obscured perhaps. כ and ׀, however, are very similar in the old "square" characters and may have been confused in the MSS.

Other examples of such confusion of letters may be seen in the following: יָרַעַם = עָם 4:14; לְעֶרְתָם = לְצֶרְתָם 7:12; חֶכְךָ שִׁפָּר = חֶק כַּעֲפָר 8:1; יָרַעַם = יָרַעַם 9:2; יִשְׂרָר = יִשְׂרָר 10:11; לָפִי = לָפִי 10:12; שָׂר = שָׂר 10:14. Cf. also the more doubtful וַיִּשֶׁם = וַיִּשֶׁם 13:1; אִשְׁרָנוּ = אִשְׁרָנוּ 14:9; רָקַב = קָטַב 5:12 (cf. 13:14 ?).

X. Very peculiar are the variations in the translation of the particles. In many cases the variation may be affected by the context as in the case of כִּי which is frequently translated by ὅτι and ὁὐότι but after a negative by ἀλλά. But as an accurate knowledge of the use of particles seems to be one of the last attainments in the study of a language, the translator is not to be censured if he allow the context as he understands it to determine the force of a particle. This our translator seems to have done always, rather than to have used the particles at any time as an aid in discovering the meaning of a particular passage. The following groupings of the translations of prepositions, conjunctions, etc., will serve to show this:

כֹּאשֶׁר = καθὼς ἄν, 7:12; ἐν τρόπῳ, 9:13.

אַחַר ('אחרי) = ὁπίσω generally, but μετὰ ταῦτα, 3:5.

אַךְ = ἄρα, 12:12; πλὴν, 12:9; ὅπως, 4:4(?).

יַחַד = ἐν τῷ αὐτῷ, 11:8; יַחַד = ἐπὶ τὸ αὐτό, 2:2.

לֹא = οὐ and οὐ μή frequently; ἤ, 6:6.

עַל כֵּן { διὰ τοῦτο, 4:3, etc. Cf. לְכֵן also, 2:8, 16, etc.
ἐνεκα, 13:6.

* Cf. Wellhausen's *Der Text der Bücher Samuelis*. Göttingen, 1872. Pp. 18 and 169.

כִּי	{	ὅτι and <u>διότι</u> , general.	בֵּן	{	ἐκ, general.
		ἀλλ' ἦ, 1:6; 7:14.			ἀπό, 2:20; 5:3, etc.
ב	{	διὰ τοῦτο, 8:10; 9:6.	ב	{	διά, 8:4.
		ὅταν, 4:14.			μετά, 6:2.
ב	{	ἐν, general.	ב	{	μή, 2:11(?).
		ἐπί, 2:25; 3:5, etc.			εἰς, 7:4.
ב	{	εἰς, 4:7; 5:5, etc.	ב	{	ἦ, 2:9; 6:6.
		πρός, 2:4.			ὥς, general.
ל	{	κατά, 2:11.	ב	{	καθώς, 2:5; 3:1, etc.
		σύν, 4:3.			κατά, 2:17; 4:7, etc.
ל	{	μετά, 5:6.	ב	{	οὕτως, 4:9.
		dative, 7:9.			ἐπί, general.
ל	{	dative general.	על	{	κατά, 7:13; 8:1.
		genitive, 1:9; 2:14, etc.			ἐν, 7:14.
ל	{	εἰς, 2:14; 2:21, etc.	על	{	διά, 9:15.
		πρός, 5:1.	על	{	πρός, general.
עם	{	ἐπί, 2:20; 3:3.			ἐπί, 3:3; 3:5, etc.
		ἐν, 9:5.			εἰς, 7:15; 8:1, etc.
עם	{	μετά, general.	על	{	ἐν, 4:8.
		πρός, 4:1; 12:3, etc.			

Perhaps a table of some of the Greek particles with their equivalents in Hebrew, according to the translation, may be of interest in showing the peculiarities in an even more striking way.

ὅπως	=	אך, 4:4	למען (8:3)
ὅπως ἂν	=	פן, 2:5(?)	ὅπως μή = כל (כִּי לֹא ?), 14:3
διότι καὶ ἔαν	=	אם כִּי (9:12)	גם כִּי (9:16)
ἐν	=	ב*	על בקרב (5:4; 11:9)
εἰς	=	ב	כמו (8:12)
ἐπί	=	ב	על אל
πρός	=	ב	על אל
κατά	=	ב	על ב
μετά	=	ב	עם מן
διά	=		על מן
ἀπό	=	מן מתחת (4:12)	οὕτως = ב כן
μή	=	אל לא	מן
διὰ τοῦτο	=	לכן על כן	כִּי (8:10)
πλήν	=	אך (12:9)	זולתי (13:4)
ἐάν	=	אם (9:12)	אולי (8:7)

* The equivalent most frequently used is underscored; in most cases the references in the above table suffice.

Thus the majority of the variations which may be attributed to the translator have been considered, and the general character of the translation in cases in which the text underlying it was similar to the Massoretic text, has been noted. It has been seen that passages in which the Greek text is corrupt or doubtful, are of such a nature, usually, as to indicate that they should not be used in textual study. The cases of free translation are such as may readily be detected, either in the peculiar reading or difficulty of the passage, or in the approximate sense expressed. Most of these are of such a nature that, if held to indicate difference of recension, one could only substitute a word related in meaning to that in the text.

Interesting cases of the use of the same Greek word for different Hebrew words, such as ἀνταποδίδωμι for שָׁלַם in 9:8 and 14:3, for יָשׁוּב in 4:9; 12:2,14; and different Greek words for the same Hebrew word, as חָבַל = διαφθορά, 11:4, and ὠδίνες, 13:13, which is used for בָּטָן, 9:11, show that the translator, not always influenced by a desire for uniformity, simply expressed what he regarded as the sense of a particular passage.

There are also slight traces of local influence in the translation as the probable reference to *ραβδομαγεία*, a sort of divination among the Greeks, in 4:12; also a reference to the rites of Venus and other deities in the τετελεσμέναι of 4:14. In both cases, however, the translation is fair and may have no reference to customs of the Greeks. But after having attributed to the translation all that can fairly be considered as belonging to it, in accordance with the general disposition or tendency of the translator,—his evident fairness of intention,—there still remains a number of variations unexplained.

DOUBTFUL CASES.

There is a number of variations the character of which is doubtful. One cannot say positively that they are due to difference of recension, but they seem to be due to this. In some cases the readings are certainly not as good as those given in the Massoretic text, but at the same time they bear evidence of having been translated from Hebrew, while in other cases they are much better than the received reading.

I. Under this division additions may be considered first.

1. No great stress can be laid on the addition of a letter or particle, yet there are a few cases in which such an addition gives a different and often a good reading.

In 2:13 the connective καί occurs between all except the first two nouns. Why not here? If the translator inserted it, why not between each word as in 1:1 and 2:7? If this difference is recensional, perhaps in the original construction the words following כָּל מְשֹׁשֶׁה were adverbial accusatives as Briggs seems to take

them in the translation, "And I will cause all her mirth to cease in her feasts (and) her new moons and her sabbaths and all her festivals."* It is in fact the *mirth* of these feasts that is the prominent idea. Cf. Amos 8:10; Isa. 58:13. Adopting this construction of the passage, Cheyne's observation, that the sabbath did not pass away, becomes unnecessary.

In 13:13 חבלי ילדה = ὥδινες ὡς τικτούσης. It is difficult to determine whether ὡς is inserted to relieve the difficulty of the sudden change to the representation of Ephraim as a son immediately following, or is due to difference in MSS. It seems scarcely probable, if the translator had inserted it, that he would have been so exact in retaining the construct relation, with the particle intervening, though this construction may occur in Hebrew.

In 4:19 מַזְבְּחוֹתָם = ἐκ τῶν θυσιαστηρίων αὐτῶν. If this is to be taken as it usually is, it is the only instance of such a plural for זֶבֶח. The reading of the LXX., מַזְבְּחוֹתָם, or perhaps with ם omitted in order to avoid the repetition of the same sound, is better. So Hitzig, citing Zech. 14:10, etc.

In 10:15, for כָּכָה עָשָׂה לָכֶם בֵּית-אֵל, the LXX. has οὕτως ποιήσω ὑμῖν, οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ. The addition of an א before עָשָׂה and יִשָּׁר before אֵל would give the reading at the basis of the LXX., viz., אַעֲשֶׂה לָכֶם בֵּית יִשְׂרָאֵל, which gives good sense here. Why should Bethel be represented as doing this and not Yahweh? Cf. 10:11; 11:1, etc. Ewald made Yahweh, understood, the subject of עָשָׂה and בֵּית-אֵל accusative of place. However, οἶκος τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ may have arisen from taking it as synonymous with the Hebrew, in its meaning, *house of God*; the other is generally בֵּית אֵל.

Other additions of this nature are οὐδέ in 1:7 (some MSS. have (ὀκνοῦσιν); ἐτι, 1:8; ὡς, 5:1, and ὅτι, 5:6.

2. There are also cases in which a word, phrase or even sentence is found in the Greek but not in the Hebrew. In 2:25 for אֱלֹהֵי the reading of the LXX. is Κύριος ὁ θεός μου εἰ σύ, requiring יהוה אלהי אתה, and this carries out the parallelism, giving a better balance of clauses, as well as a better meaning. Other gods are spoken of, as in 3:1, but Yahweh is the distinctive God of the Israelites.

In 6:1 the LXX. has λέγοντες as an addition. With this the Targum and the Peshitta agree, but in the connection it might be inserted in interpretation legitimately, and so one cannot say that the difference is recensional; nor of the addition τὸν θεὸν ἡμῶν after πρὸς κύριον for אֵל יְהוָה can one say much more, though it is probable, as in 2:25, that the full expression occurred here.

In 13:4 a most peculiar and remarkable passage is found in the Greek, viz., ἐγὼ δὲ κύριος ὁ θεός σου ὁ στερεῶν τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ κτίζων γῆν, οὐ αἱ χεῖρες ἐκτίσαν πᾶσαν τὴν στρατιὰν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, καὶ οὐ παρέδειξά σοι αὐτὰ τοῦ πορεύεσθαι ὀπίσω αὐτῶν· καὶ ἐγὼ ἀνῆγαγον

* *Messianic Prophecy*. New York, 1886. P. 170; (and) is inserted.

σε ἐκ γῆς Αἰγύπτου κ.τ.λ. For this Newcome* has given the following Hebrew, which he supposes to have been the basis of the LXX., viz.,

ואנכי יהוה אלהיך
נטה שמים וברא ארץ
ידי עשו כל צבא השמים
ולא הריתיך אתם ללכת אחריהם
ואנכי מעלך מארץ מצרים
“ואלהים וגו’

The omission in the Hebrew he thought might have arisen through the carelessness of the scribes, passing from one **ואנכי** to the other. For ἀνῆγαγον he has the participle **מעלך** which is possible, though not what a retranslation of the Greek requires; in Ps. 81:11 the LXX. has the form ἀναγαγόν for **המעלך**. The Greek here requires **העליתך** though in this place perhaps the participle is better. The passage gives evidence of having been translated from Hebrew by the Hebraisms which it contains. The occurrence of the article in τὸν οὐρανόν and its omission in κτίζων γῆν is peculiar. The position of the indirect object σοι when not emphatic is peculiar in Greek, but regular in Hebrew. However, if the passage did occur in the MS. before the translator it certainly is not from the hand of the Prophet. Sabaism among the Israelites is not mentioned until the time of Manasseh. At all events its influence came too late for Hosea's notice and moreover this is the only mention of it in the book, and it is not to be supposed that one of so intense a spirit as Hosea, would have been satisfied with giving it such a simple and passing notice as this. As to ἀνῆγαγον it may be noted that in this place it gives a better balance of clauses to retain it; in 12:10, however, it is not so well retained. Other cases of this nature are found in the occurrence of γῆς before Αἰγύπτου for **ממצרים**, 12:14; cf. 12:10 and 13:4; θεὸν ἡμῶν, 14:3, cf. 6:1; αὐτοῖς after εὐρη for **תמצא**, 2:9.

Some of the additions are cases in which a clause seems to be repeated from another verse, but one cannot say whether this was a copyist's error in the MS. from which the translation was made or is due to a Greek copyist. In 2:14 the addition καὶ τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τὰ ἔρπετά τῆς γῆς is perhaps made by a copyist in order to assimilate it to verse 20, but one expects the promise to be wider than the threat of punishment. There can be no motive on the part of a copyist for the omission in Hebrew. In 8:13, καὶ ἐν Ἀσσυρίοις ἀκάθαρτα φάγονται is probably taken from 9:3. With the addition καὶ σὺν τοῖς ἔρπετοῖς τῆς γῆς (4:3) cf. 2:14, 20.

II. There was, no doubt, on the part of early translators and copyists, a

* *Critical Version of the Minor Prophets.* (In loco.)

In 10:10 for the Hebrew בְּאַסֵּר...בְּאוֹתִי וְאֶסֶר the LXX. has (*ἡλθε**) παιδεύσαι αὐτούς...ἐν τῇ παιδείᾳ αὐτοῦς; the Vulgate, “cum corripientur propter duas iniquitates suas”; the Peshitta, מַלְּאֲכָאֵי שְׂחֻמֵּי חַטֵּאתֵיהוֹן. בְּאוֹתִי seems to have been taken wrongly from בּוֹא , but the important point in this connection is in the last clause. The form on which the above translations of this clause are based must have been בְּהוֹסֵר and this in connection with “iniquities” (undoubtedly the correct translation here) gives a good sense. This verb and וְאֶסֶר seem to have the same meaning and as Ewald observed אֶסֶר in force is weak and obscure.

In 4:18 the LXX, *ἡγάπησαν* for אָהֲבוּ אֹהֲבֵי gives no equivalent, but of course it is impossible to give an exact translation and so אָהֲבוּ may have been omitted. It seems more probable, however, that it is a repetition of the last three letters of אָהֲבוּ by a copyist.

III. There are also certain variations in number, person, gender, etc., which often give a good reading but yet are of a doubtful character. Such may be seen in 12:5, where, for **ויתחנן לו ביתאל ימצאנו**, the LXX. has *καὶ ἐδέχθησάν μου, ἐν τῷ οἴκῳ Ὦν εὐροσάν με*, a strange variation for which there seems to be no good explanation unless it is connected with the substitution of *οἴκῳ Ὦν* for **ביתאל**, which may best be considered then in this connection, though not properly belonging here. About the time the translation was made and before this certain “tendency changes”† are said to have been made, such as **ביתאל** for **ביתאון**, **מזבח** for **מצבה**; cf. p. 211. Elsewhere in the book **ביתאון** is found, but here the historical reference demands **ביתאל**. However, one cannot say whether this is due to the translator or to the MS. which he used, and the other variations are probably connected with this. At the end *πρὸς αὐτούς* for **עמנו**, as Cheyne

† See Geiger's *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel*, pp. 259-433. Breslau, 1857.

observes, was probably for עִמּוֹ. When used of the community the singular suffix is often translated by the plural, and so the LXX. may have taken it here. The Peshitta, which otherwise does not agree with the LXX., has חֲסִי and this suits the context better.

In 13:8 the Hebrew is וְאַחֲלִים יָשָׁם בְּלִבָּיָא; the LXX., καὶ καταφάγονται αὐτοὺς ἐκεῖ σκύμνοι δρυμοῦ; the Peshitta, סִנְכַסְתִּי אֶת־לִבִּי. Sebök thinks they may have read וְאַחֲלִים or וְאַחֲלִים (the latter, if the person is changed, gives the proper consecution in tense, though the form in the text following in the same person as the preceding verbs may be regarded as coördinate with these), כ before לִבָּיָא being erased. He also takes the preceding verbs in the first person as establishing the Massoretic text; however, it is to be noted that the following verb is in the third person, and this arrangement would make the first two and the second two agree.

In 2:8 for רִכְכָּךְ the LXX. is τὴν ὁδὸν αὐτῆς; the Peshitta, סִבְלִי. Preceding and following this the third person is used, and such a change is hardly justifiable, even in Hosea, where the change is not infrequent. רִכְכָּךְ "has nothing but difficulty in its favor" (Briggs).

In 4:8 for נַפְשִׁי the LXX. has τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν; the Peshitta, נַפְשִׁי; the Vulgate, "animas eorum;" Symmachus and Theodotion, ἐν ταῖς ψυχαῖς αὐτῶν. Thus the versions as well as some MSS. read נַפְשִׁי and this is demanded by the context. However, see page 197. Compare also יִכְרַתוּ = יִכְרַת, note ו following, 12:2; כה = כס, 9:2.

IV. There is also a number of cases in which a substitution of one part of speech for another or a variation of expression is such that it is difficult to determine whether the reading is due to difference of MSS. or to the translator. There may be noted,

1. Cases of the variation of a word or expression, as in 1:7, where, for the Hebrew וְאֶת־בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה, the LXX. has τοὺς δὲ υἱοὺς Ἰουδα, requiring וְאֶת־בְּנֵי יְהוּדָה, which was probably in the MS. before the translator. Both expressions occur in Hebrew for the same idea, and in the Greek οἶκος may be used, as well as the expression here used, to convey this idea, viz., that of posterity. There is a score of places in the Bible where this interchange occurs, the LXX. having one form and the Hebrew the other. Perhaps these may be recensional; they may, however, be explained as due to the translator's desire for variety of expression, as the use of ἀγαπάω for רחם in 2:25 (where, however, the variant ἐλεέω agrees with that in 2:3,6) must be explained. Similar to the foregoing is the variation in 2:1, יֹאמֶר לָהֶם לֹא עָמִי אַתֶּם יֹאמֶר לָהֶם בְּנֵי אֱלֹהִים; ἐρρέθη αὐτοῖς οὐ λαὸς μου ὑμεῖς, κληθήσονται καὶ αὐτοὶ υἱοὶ κ.τ.λ. If exact, the translation of the second verb requires יִקְרָא. For such variation compare Isa. 62:4 and 32:5, where, however, the LXX. in the first passage translates both words by καλέω, the last by εἶπον in both forms.

In 3:4 for **מצבה** the LXX. is *θυσιαστήριον* = **מזבח**. Sebök explains the variation as due to the confusion of letters, **ז** for **צ** and **ח** for **ה**, or as a "tendency change." This latter seems more probable. Professor Ladd observes, "The effect from the dislike of idols and their surroundings may be seen in the change by the later Jews of the word **מצבה**—sacred stone images which served as altars but which were regarded as objectionable, although they appear in Genesis as used by the Patriarchs, often consecrated to the service of Jehovah,—into **מזבח**."* The Professor shows by a comparison of 2 Kgs. 3:2 with 1 Kgs. 16:32 that **מצבה** is the original in the latter; he also observes that the verb **קום** does not well apply to **מזבח** but to **מצבה**; cf. Deut. 16:22.

The peculiar translation of **אפור ותרפים** by the LXX. *ιερατείας οὐδὲ δῆλων*, may possibly be attributed to the same cause. If not, the translator may have taken **אפור** in its usual meaning as an article of sacerdotal dress, and this then as the insignia of priesthood, and connected with this the Urim and Thummim which *δῆλος* represents elsewhere (Thummim, Deut. 33:8; Urim, Num. 27:21 and 1 Kgs. 28:6). It may, however, be a free translation of **תרפים** as giving knowledge of things doubtful and hidden. In such cases there is too little basis for decision.

In 2:16 **אנכי מפתיה** = LXX. *ἐγὼ πλανῶ*. **פתה** is here taken in the bad sense and so Cheyne's citation of Ps. 107:40, where this word is the translation of **תעה**, hardly seems necessary, though this same verb is used for **תעה** in 4:12 and possibly occurred here. However, **פתה** is thus translated in Ezek. 14:9 and Prov. 1:10.

In 8:11 for the Hebrew **לחטא** the LXX. is *ἡγαπημένα*, requiring **אהובים**(?), and this is better than the repetition of **לחטא** which may be a corruption from **לאהבה**(?).

In 13:6 **שבעו** = LXX. *εἰς πλησμονήν* = **לשבעה**; cf. p. 209, for **בית-אל**, 12:5.

2. Cases in which the variation may be due to a confusion of consonants.

In 5:2 for **ושחטה שטים העמיקו ואני מוסר לכלם** the LXX. is *ὁ οἱ ἀγρῶντες τὴν θήραν κατέπεξαν. ἐγὼ δὲ παιδευτῆς ὑμῶν*; the Peshitta, **ܫܬܝܡܝܢ ܥܡܝܩܝܢ ܐܢܝ ܡܘܨܪ ܠܟܠܡܗܘܢ**. The Massoretic text is so peculiar that one is inclined to look with favor on the versions of the LXX. and Peshitta, which carry on the figure of the preceding verse. *ἀγρεύω* occurs twice for **צור**, though Trommius† gives **גאה** for this word in Job 10:16, while in Prov. 6:25 it occurs possibly for **לקח**. With only these few and doubtful cases one cannot easily find what was the basis here. *θήρα* is usually the translation of **ציד**, cf. Gen. 25:28; 27:4; and it seems

* *Doctrine of Sacred Scripture*. New York. Vol. I., p. 707.

† *Concordantiae Graecae in Septuaginta*, etc. Amsterdam 1718, p. 18.

probable that צור (cf. Peshitta) was not the basis here or it would have been translated by *θηρεῖω*. Moreover the peculiar position of the relative and the construction here is unexpected. The variation may be explained, though unsatisfactorily, by the confusion of letters, צי = ש, ר = ה and ס for ט, צידים(?), לכ(ל) = לכס. It is easier, however, with Sebök to suppose a confusion of sound in which הצדים = השטים. The MSS. seem to have been obscure here. Compare that preceding, viz., at the end of ch. 4; cf. p. 214.

In 9:13 for the Hebrew לצור שתולה בנוה the LXX. has *εἰς θήραν παρέστησαν τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν*, simplifying the difficult Massoretic reading, and with slight alteration, giving a fair parallelism. However, there has been a confusion of letters, etc., and as the reading involves the unexpected change from בניהם in the first part to בניו in the second, also the use of ציר in a sense in which it does not occur elsewhere so far as I have been able to learn, it may be due to the translator. The form שתולה(ה) = שתולה in this reading.

In 9:7 for the Hebrew ידעו ישראל אויל הנביא the LXX. has *καὶ κακωθήσεται Ἰσραὴλ ὥσπερ ὁ προφήτης κ.τ.λ.* The difficulty of the Massoretic text renders the translation doubtful. The LXX. seems not to have had אויל and this may be a repetition of the last letters of the preceding word; however, as אויל is frequently translated by *κακόν* it may be contained in *κακωθήσεται*, which requires ידעו for ידעו(ה). הנביא in this reading would be כנביא. The idea then is that at that time Israel will be humiliated as the prophet is now. The last clause of the verse is probably altered to render the verb conformable with the previous עונך. ἐπληθύνθη for רבה is better syntax than the A.V., viz., "great hatred." According to the received reading of this verse, as Cheyne suggests, it is necessary to supply some introductory words if the idea of reproach is conveyed. But if the true prophets are referred to, in what sense is ידעו used?

In 11:4 for the Hebrew וְאֵת אֱלֹוֹ אֹכִיל: לֹא וְנֹ the LXX. has *καὶ ἐπιβλέψομαι πρὸς αὐτόν, δυνήσομαι αὐτῷ κ.τ.λ.* The peculiar form אֹכִיל may have misled the translator, and even if it comes from אכל an object would be expected. This and the fact that לֹא at the beginning of the following verse is inconsistent with 8:13; 9:3,6; 11:11, unless indeed one admit with Kuenen* that the prophet contradicts himself, favors the reading לו which interchange with לֹא is not infrequent in the קרי and כתיב, and this with אֹכִיל is no more difficult than the peculiar use of the word. ἐπιβλέψομαι may be a free translation of אֵת or אֲבִיט(?). The misconception of the preceding part of the verse (cf. p. 204) is shown here also, but this does not greatly affect it for the purpose here considered.

In 5:11 for צן the LXX. has *τὸν ματαίων = שוא*, which is frequently translated by *μάταιος*.† If צן were the form the article would be expected. The

* *Prophets and Prophecy in Israel*. London, 1877. P. 158.

† Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen*, p. 411, regards *ματαίων* as a free translation of צן (Vulgate), which was changed to צן on account of offensiveness.

error of a scribe would be the more easy, since the initial letters of **וְאֵנִי** are the same as the last letters of **יְשׁוּעַ** (Secker).

In 9:3 for the Hebrew **וְשָׁב אֶפְרַיִם מִצָּרִים** the LXX. has *κατέφησεν Ἐφραίμ Αἰγυπτου* and this carries out the contrast with the first part of the verse very well, but possibly it is a confusion of **י** for **ן** since the conjunction would be expected here. Cf. also 14:8, **יִשְׁבּוּ** = *καθιόνται* = **יִשְׁבּוּ** (?).

In 7:1 **כִּרְפָּאִי** = *Ἐν τῷ ἰάσασθαί με* = **כִּרְפָּאִי** (?). Cf. 6:11.

V. Closely connected with the preceding are a few cases of transposition of letters and words as in 8:13, where, for **זִבְחִי הִבְהִי יִזְבְּחוּ בֶשֶׂר וַיֹּאכְלוּ**, the LXX. has *διότι ἐὰν θύῃσιν θυσίαν καὶ φάγῃσι κρέα*. The Hebrew is peculiar and difficult, if indeed it is Hebrew at all. Usually the LXX. follows the Hebrew order, especially in difficult passages, and the translation here would indicate that the Hebrew at the basis of it was, **כִּי אִם יִזְבְּחוּ זִבְחַי יֹאכְלוּ בֶשֶׂר**, which gives the same arrangement of clauses as the received reading, or even better than this. **יִזְבְּחוּ** looks very much like a peculiar repetition of the letters in **זִבְחַי** slightly altered, viz., **ה** for **ח**. For the use of **אִם כִּי** cf. 9:12 (LXX.); cf. also **כִּי גַם**, 9:16.

In 6:3 for the Hebrew **כַּמְלִקוֹשׁ יוֹרָה אֶרֶץ** the LXX. has *πρώτος καὶ δεύτερος γῆ*, and this order requires **יֹרָה וּמַלְקוֹשׁ (ל) אֶרֶץ**, taking **יֹרָה** as a noun as the A.V. also. The arrangement would then be similar to that in Joel 2:23, but the usual order may be taken because the word is taken as a noun, though this is not probable.

In 7:16 for the Hebrew **יִשׁוּבוּ לֹא עַל** the LXX. has *ἀπεστράφησαν εἰς οὐδέν*; the Peshitta, **לֹא עַל**. These versions give little help here; they seem to have taken these two words in the reverse order, viz., **עַל לֹא**, unless the sense is "to the not high one," "no god" (Gesenius), which is not probable. In the former case **לֹא** would hardly be used as this arrangement requires. Williams' conjecture, **לֹא לֵאמֹר**,* is also impossible.

In 13:10 for the Hebrew **אֲחִי מֶלֶכְךָ אֶפְרַיִם** the LXX. has *ποῦ ὁ βασιλεὺς σου οὗτος*; which is a fair translation, taking **אֲחִי** as an interrogative, and it seems probable that the letters **י** and **ח** have been transposed, the original being **אִיח**, and this is confirmed by **אֶפְרַיִם**, which would naturally follow **אִיח** as an enclitic, but is peculiar after **אֲחִי**. The form **אֲחִי** would arise the more easily since it occurs in v. 7 and elsewhere. The forms in v. 14 were probably **אִיח** also. So the versions in 13:10.

In 13:15 there is clearly a transposition of letters, **אֶרְצוּ** for **אֹרְצוּ**, but amiss.

RECENSIONAL VARIATIONS.

There are still other variations of a different nature from those already considered. These are of such a character that they can only be explained by

* *The Hebrew Prophets*. London, 1886. *In loco*.

supposing the translator to have used a MS. differing somewhat from the MSS. underlying the present Massoretic text. An examination of these cases will show this. There may be noted,

I. Additions.

In 4:17 for הִנֵּחַ-לּוֹ the LXX. has ἐθηκεν ἐαυτῷ σκάνδαλα. Nowack and Simson regard this as an interpretation in explanation of the preceding עֲצִבִּים, but as Ewald perceived there is an incompleteness in the verse as it now stands, "And Ephraim shall not be left with his idols as is strongly enough expressed, v. 19." The sentiment too is foreign to the spirit of Hosea and especially so if satirical. This also is against the reading of Ewald, viz., "the scandal giveth him restoration." He supposes some such word as מִכְשׁוֹל to have dropped out of the text and vocalizes הִנֵּחַ. It seems better, however, to vocalize הִנִּיחַ, which is used of the setting up of idols (cf. Isa. 46:7 and 2 Kgs. 17:29), and to construe (מִכְשׁוֹלִים) as object of the verb. Thus the reading would be, *Ephraim is joined to idols, he hath set a stumbling-block for himself*. The last clause then carries out the idea preceding and gives good parallelism; note also the connection with the following verse according to the LXX.

In 4:18 for אַהֲבוּ (הֲבוּ) קִלּוֹן מִגְּנִיָּה the LXX. has ἠγάπησαν ἀτιμίαν ἐκ φρονήματος αὐτῆς. By the addition of a letter (א) and a change of pointing, a variant, and in this case a much better reading, is obtained. The MSS. underlying the Massoretic text seem to have been corrupted or obscure in this place as the peculiar Hebrew and variations of the LXX. in the last verses of this chapter as well as the opening of the next chapter indicate. The Hebrew of this clause is certainly very peculiar, but accepting a suggestion of the LXX., an excellent reading is obtained. Hermann* pointed out the fact that though the present reading of the LXX. gives no fit sense, yet a restoration of that which was its basis gives a form susceptible of a good translation: he suggests מִגְּנִיָּה with the translation "sie lieben Schande mehr als ihre Ehre." Cheyne favors this correction, referring גִּאֲוֹן to Yahweh, the Pride of Israel, her God. Cf. Zech. 11:3. He would then translate "*they love infamy rather than her Excellency*." The peculiarity of the Greek shows that the translator was following Hebrew.

II. There are also a few cases of omission which indicate that certain letters and words were not in the MS. before the translator.

In 2:23 for the Hebrew אַעֲנֶה נָא יְהוָה אֶעֱנֶה אֶת הַשָּׁמַיִם the LXX. has λέγει κύριος ἐπακούσομαι τῷ οὐρανῷ. The first אַעֲנֶה occurs unexpectedly here in the Hebrew and evidently was not in the MS. before the translator, for it is not his tendency to omit.

In 8:2 for לִי יִעֲקֹב אֱלֹהֵי יִדְעֲנוּךָ יִשְׂרָאֵל the LXX. has ἐμὲ κεκράζονται ὁ θεὸς ἐγνωκαμέν σε. יִשְׂרָאֵל occurs in a peculiar position and is probably taken from the following verse; a copyist's error, since there can be no reason for its omission.

* Studien und Kritiken. 1879. P. 517.

In 14:3 for the Hebrew וּנְשַׁלְמָה פְּרִים שְׁפָתֵינוּ the LXX. has καὶ ἀνταποδόσομεν καρπὸν χειλέων ἡμῶν. Here the omission of a letter causes an important change and relieves a clumsy construction of the Hebrew. The difficulty of the received reading is the only thing in its favor, if indeed the construction is justifiable. But it is just such peculiarities that a careful study of the LXX., and restoration of the text underlying it, will show to be incorrect readings. The proposal of Newcome to read פְּרִי after the LXX. relieves the difficulty and receives some confirmation also from Heb. 13:15, where the connection points to this passage rather than Isa. 57:19. This does not occur in the LXX. of Isa. 57:19, and נֵיב is nōt, translated by καρπός. The Peshitta also, departing from the LXX. and Massoretic text in other particulars, agrees with the LXX. in reading פְּרִי. The explanation of this variation given by Pococke, shows to what conjectures one is driven by the theory that the translation of the LXX. is based on the same MSS. as those underlying the Massoretic text, or rather that there were no variations in the MSS. He observed, 'For this end I conceive that καρπός here is by the Greek taken in the same notion that κάρπωμα or κάρπωσις is by them elsewhere used, viz., for a whole burnt offering, which usually the Rabbins tell us were some of them called קִיץ לַמִּזְבֵּחַ, the καρπός or summer fruit of the altar, so were such free-will offerings, they say, called; because they were to the altar as summer fruits to a table after a banquet.'*

III. There are also some cases of variation through change of person, number, etc. The character of these is here considered.

In 12:9 for כֹּל יִגְעִי לֹא יִמְצָאוּ לִי עוֹן אֲשֶׁר חָטָא the LXX. has πάντες οἱ πόντοι αὐτοῦ οὐχ εὐρεθήσονται αὐτῷ, δι' ἀδικίας ἧς ἥμαρτεν. When מִצָּא is used of discovering a fault it is usually followed by בְּ of person; but it is often used with לִי in the sense "to suffice," and this gives a better sense here, adopting the suffix of the third person for the first in יִגְעִי. Thus Cheyne, "(but) all his profits will not suffice for (i. e., to expiate) the guilt which he has incurred," reading כֹּל יִגְעִי לֹא יִמְצָאוּ לִי עוֹן אֲשֶׁר חָטָא; but this is a rather forced meaning, (to expiate?), and it seems better to follow the LXX., reading לוֹ for לִי and putting the preposition עַל (cf. 9:15) before עוֹן thus it would read כֹּל יִגְעִי לֹא יִמְצָאוּ לוֹ עַל עוֹן אֲשֶׁר חָטָא, i. e., all his profits will not suffice him because of the guilt which he has incurred. This gives the same connection with the next verse as the reading suggested by Cheyne as it also gets "rid of the unnatural distinction supposed above between 'iniquity' and 'sin.'"

In 11:3 for וְאֲנֹכִי תִרְגַּלְתִּי לְאַפְרִים קָחַם עַל זִרְעוֹתָיו the LXX. has καὶ ἐγὼ συνεπόδισα τὸν Ἑφραΐμ, ἀνέλαβον αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τὸν βραχίονά μου; the Vulgate, "portabam eos in bracheis meis"; the Peshitta, וְאֲנִי חָבַשְׁתִּי בְּזַרְעִי אֶת-הָעֶפְרַיִם בְּחֶמְלִי. Of the peculiar forms תִּרְגַּלְתִּי and קָחַם one cannot say much except to note

* *Theological Works*. London, 1740. Vol. II., p. 684.

reason for its omission by the translator. The conjecture of Houbigant* and others after him, viz., **יעזרך** is unnecessary since the construction with **ב** is good. Cf. Nah. 3:9; Pss. 118:7 and 35:2. Of course the translation of **שחתך** cannot be sustained as exact.

In 13:5 for the Hebrew **אני ידעתך** the LXX. has *ἐγὼ ἐποίμανόν σε*; the Peshitta, **אני ידעתך**. Here, as Sebök well points out, **יעיתך** suits the following **במדבר** as well as the next verse better. **ד** and **ר** are readily confused; note also the ' of **אני** which might easily be repeated. The Targum gives a free rendering in **אנא סופקית צורדיהון**, but it shows the sense demanded here.

In 13:15 for **כי הוא בין אחים יפריא** the LXX. has *διότι οὗτος ἀναμέσων ἀδελφῶν διαστελεῖ*; the Vulgate, "Quia ipse inter fratres dividit, etc."; the Peshitta, **לפריא**. These versions require **יפריד** instead of **יפריא**, for it is not probable that they took this verb as equivalent to the Arabic **فري**. This then becomes a reference to the separation between Judah and Israel. Cf. Zech. 11:14.

In 5:8 for the Hebrew **אחרך בנימין** the LXX. has *ἐξέστη βενιαμίν*. Here again is a peculiar phrase in Hebrew, it being necessary to supply to convey the supposed meaning, while the LXX. **חרר בנימין** is at once clear and forcible in this connection. Cf. the translation of **חרר**, 11:10,11. Cheyne's translation of this is good, viz., "Benjamin is distraught." For the conjecture of Meier,† viz., **אחרית**, I fail to find the support which he finds in the LXX. It is evident that the Massoretic reading might readily have been corrupted to the present form. Cf. Judg. 5:14.

In 13:2 for the Hebrew **כתבונם עצבים** (**ב** in some texts) the LXX. has *κατ'εἰκόνα εἰδῶσαν*; the Vulgate, "quasi similitudinem idolorum"; the Targum, **וועברו להון מתבא מכספהון**. These versions require the reading **כתבנית עצבים**, which indicates that there was no art then in the manufacture of such images (Cheyne).

In 2:11 for **לכסות** the LXX. has *τοῦ μὴ καλύπτειν*, which requires **מכסות**, as this is the usual method of translation of the infinitive with **מן**. Commentators have succeeded in explaining the use of the **ל** as that of purpose, but an ellipsis must be supposed, such as, *which should have covered*. Strange infinitive force! If referred to the nouns as **לכסות** must be, another pointing of the consonants at the basis of the LXX. would be more forcible, viz., **מכסות**. Cf. Ezek. 1:11,23, etc. However, the reading **מכסות** is the one expected from the context.

In 5:7 for **חרש** the LXX. has *ἐρσιβη*. Kuinoel's conjecture **חרש** (cited by Drake) is due to the theory that the variations must be explained so as to harmonize with the Massoretic text, and this only involves the confusion of **ר**

* *Biblia Hebraica. In loco.*

† *Studien und Kritiken. 1842. P. 1028.*

and ד, but דרש is not translated by ἐρμείβη in the LXX., though this is not decisive. It seems more probable that the reading was חסיל. Cf. Joel 1:4 (LXX.). The sense of the LXX. is manifest, needing no explanation. If חרש is taken in the sense of month, the most natural meaning, as it occurs without the article, then, as Prebendary Huxtable observes, "The Hebrew scriptures perhaps furnish no other example of that particular form of personification by which a period of time is spoken of as itself effecting what is done by other agents in it."^{*}

In 4:18 for סר סבאם the LXX. is ἡρέτισε καναναίους. It is supposed by many commentators that the translation of the LXX. arose from the reading סבאים and the confusion of the Sabeans with the Canaanites, but this again is due to a theory. Only on the supposition that the MS. underlying the translation differed somewhat from those underlying the Massoretic text, can such variations be explained satisfactorily. A remark of Ewald shows that a fair reading is given by the LXX., viz., "*it attached itself in close friendship to the Canaanites; in which case we should have to read סר כנען (comp. נוסר), and the sense would not be bad in this connection as well as suitable to the words in 12:8, if only כנען were not so very unlike the letters סבאם.*" Theory then is all that is against the reading of the LXX. סר (יסר) is not so translated in the LXX., but was chosen because of the similarity of the letters. בחר is the word most commonly so translated, but does not seem quite suitable here, though a better word does not suggest itself to the writer.

In 8:10 for ויחלו מעט ממשח מלך שרים the LXX. is καὶ κοπάσουσι μικρὸν τοῦ χρίεν βασιλέα καὶ ἄρχοντας. Ewald's rendering of the Hebrew, "cease a little" (pointing ויחלו) and "sorrow a little" (A.V.), are both open to Nowack's question, Why a little?† Nor is the reading given by Simson, Wünsche, etc., better, viz., "in a little, etc." What usage is this? מעט in 1:4, cited by Nowack, is different. Nor yet that of Hitzig, Keil,‡ R.V., etc., "they shall begin to be diminished" (reading מעט as inf. or "adj. verb"). Cheyne well asks, "Why 'begin'?" None of the above explanations being satisfactory, the only remedy is with Cheyne to turn to the LXX. which reads ויחלו מעט ממשח מלך ושרים, possibly ויחלו as Ewald read, may be retained; the rendering would be "*that they may cease for a little from anointing a king and princes.*" The reading "king and princes" is found in some Hebrew MSS. and in the versions: it is confirmed also in the following citations by Reuss,§ viz., ch. 3:4; 7:5; 8:4 and 13:10, where "king" and "princes" are thus associated.

In 3:2 for the Hebrew וחרמר שערים ולתך שערים the LXX. has καὶ γομῶρ

* Bible Commentary. London, 1876. Vol. VI., p. 440.

† Der Prophet Hosea. Berlin, 1880, p. 150.

‡ Commentary on the Minor Prophets. Edinburgh, 1878. Vol. I., p. 116.

§ La Bible. Part II. Les Prophètes. Paris, 1876. In loco.

κριθῶν καὶ νέβελ οἶνον; never ἡμικόρον for לֶתֶךְ, as Gesenius and a number of commentators give it, so far as I have been able to learn. Cheyne suggests that probably the translator was unacquainted with the “lethech;” but this fails to account for the transliteration of a Hebrew word. As לֶתֶךְ is one of the ἀπαξ λεγόμενα and there is no measure corresponding to it in the Egyptian dry measure, which, as Cheyne observes, “in other details agrees exactly with the Hebrew,” it is very difficult to determine the cause of the variation and at the same time suspicion is cast on the Hebrew word. γόμορ is used as often for חמר as for עמר,* and so one cannot determine which was in the MS. before the translator, or some aid in explaining the variation might be derived from it. οἶνον for שְׁעָרִים might be explained from the use of barley to make wine. Compare also the plural of κριθή in Greek; or possibly, according to Schleusner, “Sed mihi שְׁכָר legisse videntur.”

No explanation on the ground of the use of a MS. similar to that of the Masoretic text is satisfactory. Why should the translator give a Hebrew word in Greek letters if he did not find it in the MS. before him? Newcome supposed that θήλακος, which Symmachus used in the translation here, had crept into the Greek from the Hebrew. This change, however, would not have occurred long before the translation of the LXX., while the word is found in the Odyssey and was used also by Aristophanes; moreover there is another word, λήκυθος, which is just as likely to have come from לֶתֶךְ, but it occurs in Aristophanes, Euripides and Herodotus. It seems more probable that the Hebrew came from the Greek, from confusing the two words, perhaps, with a transposition of consonants, viz., $\theta(v)\lambda(a)\kappa(o\varsigma)$ $\lambda(\eta)\kappa(v)\theta(o\varsigma)$ —a very easy confusion with the different arrangement of the consonants in the Greek words. The former was used for meal, etc., and from the Greek translation, may have passed into Hebrew in this disguised form. There seems to have been great confusion among the Fathers in the reading of this passage. A remark by Epiphanius, viz., Λεθεκ δὲ, ὡς ἐν τῷ Ὡσηὲ τῷ προφήτῃ εἴρηται, ὅτι ἐμισθωσάμην ἑμαντῷ λεθεκ κριθῶν ἐν ἀντιγράφοις δὲ, γόμορ κριθῶν, τὸ αὐτὸ εἶσι δέκα γὰρ καὶ πέντε μῶδιοι σημαίνονται οὗτοι,† shows that he regarded the “lethech” and the homer as the same measure wrongly, thinking that there were two homers, one of twelve and the other of fifteen baths, the “lethech” corresponding to the latter. This looks as if there had been an understanding that the two expressions were equivalent or that λεθεκ was an explanation of γόμορ. In the editor's discussion of this passage, a reading from Ambrosius is cited, viz., “Et conduxi eam gomor hordei et semi-gomor hordei et nevel vini.” This combines the two readings, but affords no light on the question considered, except in showing that the texts of

* Driver, however, gives a number of instances showing γ to be the transliteration of y (ἔ ?), pp. 105, 106.

† *Patrologia Graeca*, edited by J. P. Migne. Paris, 1858. Vol. XLIII., pp. 272, 273.

the versions have been tampered with. Whatever the origin of the variation may be, the reading of the LXX. is at least as satisfactory as the received reading.

The explanation of this, referring to 2 Kgs. 7:18, and the inference that a homer and a half of barley would have a value of fifteen shekels, which plus the fifteen shekels of silver would equal the price of a slave, Ex. 21:32, is simply arbitrary. It rests upon the following uncertainties: the value of (1) barley, (2) a slave, (3) לֶחֶם; the reason for the amount being (1) the price of a slave, (2) part money, part barley. The best explanation of the received reading is that this amount was given for provision (Huxtable), and this applies to the LXX. also. Cf. I Sam. 25:18; II Sam. 16:1. An offering might also have been contemplated, cf. I Sam. 1:24; perhaps a jealousy offering, cf. Num. 5.

CONCLUDING OBSERVATIONS.

Thus it is seen that, while there are many variations in the LXX., most of these can be satisfactorily explained. It is inevitable that there should be some corruption in the Greek text, and this renders the reading in some places doubtful, but such cases are nearly always manifest and thus one is warned not to use these for critical purposes. The fact also that the translator's aim was to produce a translation for the use of the people of his times, and not that the Hebrew text might be reconstructed from it, allowed him to translate as he understood the Hebrew, and thus to interpretation a number of minor variations may be attributed. Yet the fairness and the literalness of the translation are, withal, astonishing; and these would no doubt seem even greater if we had the MS. from which the translation was made.

The faithful reproduction of Hebrew idioms and even the order of words in Hebrew is remarkable. In ch. 1:9 the translation καὶ ἐγὼ οὐκ εἶμι ὁ μωυσῆς, shows that if לֵאלֹהִים has dropped out of the text, as many suppose, it must have been before the LXX. was translated. Many other passages showing that the LXX. is a protection against rash conjecture, might also be adduced. But is the value of such a translation to end with this? So, many treat it. An example may suffice to show how the translations of the LXX. are usually treated, viz., in ch. 2:22 the text of the Western Jews is יָדַעַת אֵת יְהוָה as found in our Hebrew Bibles, but in the Babylonian codex the reading is יָדַעַת כִּי אֲנִי יְהוָה. Now if our Hebrew text had happened to have read as the Babylonian codex, no doubt those who regard the LXX. as of no value, would have found here a false translation of the LXX., supporting the text by the Vulgate, "scies quia ego Dominus." Both translations, however, may be sustained on the supposition that there were different readings in the Hebrew MSS., as there are in this case. This illustrates the difference between the explanation of the variations, by those who hold that there were different recensions of the Hebrew text, and that given by those who do not admit this.

In the present investigation it has been the aim to explain all the variations which can fairly be attributed to the translation as due to this. But after one has studied the character of these variations¹, whether due to free translation or to imperfect transmission of the text, and has noted the general tendency of the translator in those instances in which it is evident he has given a free translation, he finds that there are some variations which might possibly be attributed to the translator, but are more likely due to difference of recension or perhaps in some cases to imperfect transmission of the text. There are still other variations, however, which cannot be explained in this way. These can only be explained as arbitrary or recensional, but the general fidelity of the translator will not allow the former explanation, moreover the excellence of the readings in many cases will not admit it. Certainly the important variations are not numerous, but one would not expect many variations in Hebrew MSS. of a book the size of Hosea.

The peculiar addition in ch. 13:4 may be thought to reflect on the character of the MS. used by the translator. Yet such peculiarities may easily be detected, and it is to be remembered that if we had the early Hebrew MSS. it would be necessary to use critical judgment in choosing a variant reading, just as is the case with the MSS. of the New Testament. It seems of great importance therefore that the text of the LXX. receive more attention, that it may be had in its very best and most complete form, in order that a more careful comparison of the version with the Massoretic text may be made. Great results certainly may be expected from such study, even in the Minor Prophets, where the translators are supposed to have treated the text with great liberty.

It seems strange that the American Revisers, otherwise less conservative than the English Committee, should have disagreed with the latter in that they refused any reference to the Septuagint and other versions. Care must certainly be used and great discrimination in the study of the versions for textual purposes, but to throw such a valuable critical aid as the Septuagint out of consideration, is to reject what Providence has preserved ; it is to close one's eyes to the light.

NOTES ON THE ANALYSIS OF GENESIS I.-XXXI.*

BY BENJAMIN W. BACON,

Oswego, N. Y.

In the so-called *Urgeschichte*, Gen. I.-XII., the analysis of Budde,† if taken with a grain of salt derived from Kuenen,‡ seems to the present writer on the whole a true one. If the poetic structure discovered by Prof. Briggs§ in Gen. I. really exists, this lends additional force to the argument that this chapter, in other respects so strongly contrasting with the usual style of P, was not original with him, but worked over and incorporated from J². For elsewhere in the priestly document there is not one trace of poetry discoverable, either in thought or structure. A further bit of evidence in favor of Budde's J² (considered by him to have employed *Elohim* previous to Gen. IV. 26—cf. ver. 25) may be derived from Deut. IV. 32 sqq., where indeed *Elohim* in 33 sq. may be accounted for by translating a God; but not in ver. 32. Here the most probable explanation to my mind, in view of the general practice of D, is a retained peculiarity of the source, and so also in 33 sq. There being absolutely no trace of P in D, this reference may accordingly be taken as evidence for an underlying elohistic J² in Gen. I.||

In Gen. VI. 4 I regard the first two clauses אַחֲרֵי־כֵן . . . הַנְּפִלִים as due to supplementary redaction in place of a simple, וַיְהִי כֹ, an interpolation intended to explain the *Nephilim* of Num. XIII. 33. But the original writer was not giving an aetiology of *Nephilim*, but of *Gibborim*, for the identifying of whom with the *Nephilim* there is not only no evidence, but ver. 4b indicates them to have been quite a different class from the *Nephilim*, and by no means necessarily of gigantic stature. Cf. x. 8 sqq. with Num. XIII. 33. In the latter passage the *Nephilim* appear to be E's parallel to J's *beni-Anak* of vs. 22, 32. At least there can be no certainty that any mention of *Nephilim* occurs in J, and the superfluity if not the disagreement of this clause with the latter part of the verse, together with the extreme awkwardness of its position, seem to be against it.

When J relates the birth of a person or class of persons of importance he says, "— took to wife — and — went in unto — and she (they) bare a child (children) unto him" (them), and then proceeds to tell what became of the child

* A series of sketches preliminary to the author's new analysis of Gen. I.—Ex. XX. in *Bibles within the Bible*. Student Pub. Co., Hartford, Conn., 1891.

† *Die bibl. Urgeschichte untersucht*. Glessen, 1883.

‡ *Th. Tijdschrift*, XVIII. 121-171.

§ *Biblical Study*, p. 278, and *HEBRAICA*, April, 1888.

|| Cf. Wellhausen *Comp. d. Hex.* (Berlin, 1889), 186-189.

or children. Cf. iv. 1,25; xxxviii. 2 sq., etc. He does not interrupt or anticipate this natural order by inserting in advance what the child is going to be after it is born, nor other information which has nothing to do with the story of the birth, but tells his story connectedly. Read now vi. 1-4 as the aetiology of the Gibborim, of whom Nimrod is one mentioned later, and omit ver. 3 (according to Budde displaced from after iii. 21), and the disturbing clauses at the beginning of ver. 4, inserting a simple ׀ after אִשָּׁר, or וִידֵי כְאִשָּׁר, and we have just what J uniformly writes in such cases: "The sons of God saw the daughters of men that they were fair; and they took them wives of all that they chose. And the sons of God came in unto the daughters of men and they bare children unto them; the same were the *Gibborim* which were of old, the men of renown."

Kautzsch and Socin* call attention to the fact that x. 1b is probably from J², and argue thence that ix. 18 sq. = R. Insert, however, x. 1b between ix. 19a and 19b and there is no occasion for rejecting anything but 18b.

From vs. 8,13,15 it may perhaps be inferred that in J² the sons of Ham were a triad, Cush, Mizraim, and Canaan.

For the analysis of ch. xv. see HEBRAICA, vii. 1.

Chapters xx.-xxii. are admitted by all critics to have undergone harmonistic treatment by JE only less severe than that of ch. xv. where E's narrative is first introduced. Omissions occur not only after xx. 2 (cf. vs. 6b,17 sq.), but in ch. xxi. the substance of xxvi. 12-25 (J) has fallen out between vs. 21 and 22, as appears from ver. 25. The aetiology of Beersheba is retained, perhaps because it differs in its etymology from that of ch. xxvi. It has repeatedly been remarked, however, that portions of the last verses (32b,33) do not fit this narrative. Yahweh, ver. 33, might be explained as a scribal alteration. Not so, however, 32b, which assumes that Beersheba is not in the land of the Philistines, but that Abimelech and Phicol have come away from their own land. This is in accord with xxvi. 26 sq., but not with xx. 15; xxi. 22 sq. and 34. The subject of the verbs in ver. 33 is also curiously wanting. But to attribute 32b sq. to R is a mere subterfuge; there is no motive for interpolation. To the above objections to 32b, 33 in their present position I will add that 31 and 32a are equally inappropriate. The etymology led up to in vs. 28-30 is based upon שִׁבְעֵי in the sense of "seven." Abraham obtains the well for "value received," and in token hereof *should* name it "Well of the Seven," otherwise the "seven" lambs are not the "witness" they are intended to be (ver. 30). If now we are suddenly put on another track, and find that the well was not called the well of the seven but "the Well of the Oath,

* *Die Genesis*, p. 17, notes 28 and 30.

because there they *sware* both of them," it leaves the expected etymology from שבע "seven" hanging in mid-air. Ver. 32a again is here a mere repetition of ver. 27, which does not need to be repeated, because in 28 sqq. we have passed on to a new theme. Finally the form of ver. 31 is decidedly characteristic of J. The remedy for all this is a simple transposition of vs. 31-33 into the place of xxvi. 33, and of xxvi. 33 into this place. The missing subject of ver. 33 is therefore Isaac; the play upon "sware," ver. 31, finds its necessary antecedent in xxvi. 31; the returning into the land of the Philistines finds its condition precedent in xxvi. 26; the "calling on the name of Yahweh," ver. 33, and the על-כן 'ונו, ver. 31, find their explanation in the fact that these verses are taken from the J version of the Beersheba-saga. On the other hand xxvi. 33 correspondingly fits, both in style and content, with equal exactness between xxi. 30 and 34.

With regard to ch. xxii. I have only possibilities to suggest. Ver. 14 is universally acknowledged to have suffered alteration, and "Moriah," ver. 2, is of course dependent upon the altered situation and etymology. "Yahweh," v. 11, and the supplementary second appearance of the angel, vs. 15-18, are of course due also to the Jehovistic redactor, and furnish additional evidence of the *Umdeutung* the whole chapter has undergone. Nevertheless it is certain that the alteration of ver. 14 was, as usual, only superficial; for ver. 8 leads up to a derivation from the stem ראה and the saying, 14b, cannot have been manufactured. Unless the redactor was unusually fortunate in finding one exactly suited to his purpose, we must suppose that he found it in the original. Again, if he had been manufacturing an etymology for "Moriah" he surely would have made a better fit than *Yahweh-yireh*, a *lucus a non lucendo* which surpasses even the etymological wonders of J and E. May we not suppose that his work was mainly a mere alteration of Yahweh to Elohim, as elsewhere (cf. ver. 11), so that the saying, 14b, was originally of E's well-known *Mount of God* where "he is seen" by Moses and the people, Ex. iii. 6; xxiv. 11; and sought, if not seen, by Elijah, I Kgs. xix. 13 (cf. Ex. iii. 6).^{*} The transformation to "Mount of Yahweh" then immediately suggested "Moriah" (Ex. xv. 17), in place of the name of a *land* which must originally have stood in ver. 2.

What then was this "land" where the "mount of God" was? Assuredly "the land of the Negeb," Gen. xxiv. 62; Num. xiii. 29.

For a long time, mistaking the origin of "Moriah" for a phonetic modification, I had sought to connect it with *Moreh*, xii. 6 (J), Judg. vii. 1, or with האמרי, but met the objection that the hill of Moreh (Shechem) cannot possibly be called a "land," whereas "land of the Amorite" is too general, and "land of Hamor" very unlikely. A further objection not to be disregarded is the carrying

^{*} I suspect that the number 40 in xix. 8 has been conformed to Ex. xxxiv. 28.

of the wood. Carrying wood from Beersheba to Shechem or any part of the "hill country of the Amorites" is worse than "carrying coals to Newcastle." Not so if Abraham journeyed southward to the "Mount of God." The graphic imagination of the narrator depicts before his mind's eye the sandy, rocky, treeless wastes of the southern *Negeb*. Else why does he speak of the wood at all? If he simply did not think, he simply would have kept silence.

What now did Abraham, according to the original ver. 14a, "call the name of that place"? for the characteristic form of the half verse indicates that again nothing is altered here but the mere name itself. In view of ver. 8, which assuredly leads up to an original etymology from *רֶאָה*, and of 14b, which with the mere alteration of Elohim to Yahweh I judge to be original, I would suggest as possible, *El-roi*, and that we have—or should have—here E's parallel to the etymology of J in xvi. 13. True J is there aetiologizing on the name of the deity of a certain locality, whereas here it is the locality itself, perhaps the altar itself,* whose name is accounted for. But this is exactly the practice of E. He calls "the place" or "the pillar" *El-Bethel*, or *El-Elohai-Israel* (cf. xxxiii. 20; xxxv. 7). I venture therefore to think that E may have written in ver. 14, "So Abraham called the name of that place *El-roi*; as it is said to this day, In the mount of God it shall be provided."†

A very important consequence of this conjecture is the implied location of Horeb near Beer-lahai-roi. *A priori* this would be far from an unlikely scene for E's setting of the single incident he relates of Isaac, cf. xxv. 11b (J). My analysis of *Exodus* leads me to the belief that Sinai (J) and Horeb (E) are by no means identical in location, and that Horeb at least must be looked for in the *Negeb*. We shall understand then why Moses should "lead the flock to the further side of the wilderness" (from *Cush*) since he aimed at the *oasis* which had been the home of Isaac; and why Israel on their way to *Kadesh* from Egypt and *Shur* should come to Horeb the mount of God, if this was "between Kadesh and Bered," "in the way to Shur," xvi. 7, 14. We shall understand the seeming interchangeableness of Massah and Meribah, Kadesh, Rephidim and Horeb, in Ex. xvii.; Num. xx., etc.; and why Amalek who "dwelt in the land of the *Negeb*," Num. xiii. 29, should come to attack Israel there. Abraham's three days' journey from Beersheba, xxi. 4, agrees also with Hagar's wandering. It disagrees entirely to be sure with I Kgs. xix. 8. But I think there is reason to suspect the genuineness of these forty days and nights, or to doubt whether they were days and nights of travel.

Further explanations and evidence will be found in my "Bibles within the

* המקום in the pregnant sense, "the (sacred) place."

† Doubtless the sense of the *saying* was that of the margin, R.V., "He shall be seen" (cf. xvi. 13 and the conjectural reading of Well., *Comp. d. Hex.*); but E naturally prefers a less anthropomorphic sense and interprets as ver. 8 requires.

Bible" (Student Pub. Co., Hartford, Conn.), soon to appear, and in the series of articles in *Journal of Bibl. Lit.*, x. sqq., on "JE in the Middle Books." If the present conjecture bears the weight of adverse criticism, a very welcome light will be thrown upon E's whole narrative of the Exodus; "Horeb, the mount of God," Ex. III. 1, will receive the preliminary explanation of which it now stands in so much need, and even the critic who demands as the original scene of Gen. XXII., *jedenfalls eine berühmte Menschenopferstätte*, will perhaps find satisfaction.

For the analysis of ch. XXVII. see HEBRAICA, VII. 2.

In my opinion Kautzsch and Socin are right in their analysis of ch. XXVIII. and XXIX. 1-14. Kuenen's objections to XXVIII. 13-16 = J, are not conclusive, especially if, as I conceive, this passage has been taken from its original position in the connection of XXXV. 14 and transferred hither by JE. The linguistics of ver. 14, *נברכו*, *פרץ*, *משפחת*, and the doctrinal standpoint of ver. 16, which is not of an editorial nature, but leads up to the *naming*, ver. 19, speak strongly for J. On the other hand, ver. 15 cannot be assigned to J as in Kautzsch and Socin, for it follows, item by item, ver. 20, which is certainly (XXXI. 13; XXXV. 3) E's. The only obstacle to understanding J's Bethel story to have occupied originally the position where the fragment XXXV. 14 still remains, is thus removed. P had then, no doubt, authority for placing his Bethel theophany after the return from Paddan-aram, and so Hos. XII. 5 [4].

The division of Kautzsch and Socin in XXIX. 14 is to be preferred to Dillmann's. Cf. Gen. II. 23.

None of the analyses of JE in the latter part of chs. XXX. and XXXI. are acknowledged to be completely satisfactory, even by the analyzers themselves. I may be permitted therefore to present one which in some respects may possess advantages. In ch. XXX. vs. 32 and 33 are, as Wellhausen points out (*Jahrb. f. D. Th.* XXI. 428sqq.), in flagrant contradiction to both what precedes and what follows. The sense of ver. 31 is unmistakably this (cf. Dillmann, *Genesis*⁵, p. 341), "Thou shalt not give me aught *now*; hereafter, when certain lambs to be specified are born, they shall be mine" (ver. 39 sq.). In ver. 32 Jacob proposes on the contrary to sever out the speckled and spotted *now* and take them ("it shall be my hire"). The sense of the last clause of ver. 32 is not to be obliterated by connecting it with ver. 33 (Dillmann), for the sentence produced is too awkward (cf. Kautzsch and Socin, p. 67, note 125), nor can it be assumed, with Kautzsch and Socin, that the words are merely an ancient gloss, for which there is no sufficient ground. On the contrary ver. 33 agrees exactly in conception and language with 32 (both have the phrase "speckled and spotted among the goats and black among

the sheep"; elsewhere different language is employed), and both agree with xxxi. 8a, which must be the ultimate determinator of what E had. Vs. 32 and 33 taken together are perfectly in order and comprehensible. Jacob takes, as xxxi. 8 says, "the speckled"; and Laban may see for himself when he comes "to-morrow" or "in the future" that Jacob has taken none but "the speckled." This agrees neither with 31 ("thou shalt not give me aught") nor with 35 (*Laban* separates the flock); but it is self-consistent and agrees with xxxi. 8. We may therefore safely regard the whole of 32 sq. as E's.

Vs. 34-36 are then just as certainly J's, for here we have a different object in view in the separation, one which in all these verses is identical. *Laban* removes the parti-colored animals, and removes them *a long distance*, to prevent intercourse between the herds; quite a different matter from *Jacob's* mere setting apart the speckled for his own.

Vs. 37 and 38a again contain Jacob's counter-move by which Laban's cunning is over-matched. He overcomes the obstacle of distance. There is not only the immediate connection of the sense to show that this passage belongs with 34-36, but its whole spirit of diamond cut diamond over-reaching on Jacob's part is contrary to E's representation; for in E Jacob's position is that of injured innocence. God interposes on his behalf and "suffers not Laban to hurt him" (xxxii. 7), while Jacob himself is the **איש תם** of xxv. 27, "the man of simple integrity." But 38b, from **בשקתות**, "in the watering-troughs," on, is clearly E's duplicate of 38a and 39 (J). In ver. 41 (J) we have "in the gutters" simply, to which Rje has added here the parallel expression of E, by way of explanation of the unusual **רחטים**, "gutters," of J. Still more striking is the reduplication of the last clause of ver. 38 compared with the first of ver. 39. The latter verse is clearly connected with J's account (ver. 37) of Jacob's trick. Vs. 41 and 42 are also manifestly a part of the same story, and the latter verses make plain the reason of the first and last clauses of ver. 40, viz., Jacob has now charge of an exclusively white flock, and has obtained control of the color of the progeny; hence, having secured a flock of parti-colored lambs, he does not permit them to mingle indiscriminately with the white (Heb. **לבן** *laban*) flock of Laban, and so take the chances of further parti-colored births, but adopts the (in the author's eyes) surer means of the rods, allowing the progeny to resume their natural white color only when the flock are in poor condition. Laban, three days' journey distant, does not realize what is happening. Ver. 43 also is clearly J's not only on account of **פרץ** and **שפחות** but from the connection with xxxii. 4 sq. Only the middle clause of ver. 40 stands out in irreconcilable incongruity with this representation. How indeed is Jacob to "set the faces of the flocks" in any given direction? and what is it expected to accomplish when the parti-colored flock is three days' journey off? And, finally, what is the use of it when Jacob has already attained his purposes by another and easier method? The answer is, The middle clause of

ver. 40 belongs to E; and to this the language again corresponds. It is not the "speckled and spotted" (E under Laban's *first* agreement) nor "the ringstraked, speckled and spotted" (J), but "the ringstraked and all the black" (E under Laban's *second* agreement. Cf. xxxi. 8b). Thus the fragments of E in ch. xxx. agree with the résumé of the story in xxxi. 7sq. E related a changing of Jacob's wages with the final result that not merely "the stronger were Jacob's and the feebler Laban's," ver. 42 (J), but all the flock of Laban became Jacob's, xxxi. 9 (E). Laban assigned him the speckled; then *God* caused all the flock to bear speckled. He offered him the ringstraked; the *whole* progeny was ringstraked. Jacob's effort in his own behalf is confined to setting the two kinds of sheep opposite one another "at the watering-troughs" where it could easily be done (38b, 40, middle clause).

Critics are for the most part quite agreed upon the analysis of xxxi. 1-18. The only questions in debate are as to the possible interpolation of vs. 3, 10, 12. Vs. 1 and 2 are easily seen to be doublets, the former J's, the latter E's (cf. ver. 5). Ver. 3 is referred to by xxxii. 9, but this latter is itself an interpolated passage, and ver. 3 is excluded by ver. 1, which supplies the motive for Jacob's return. A didactic interest has supplemented this comparatively unworthy motive by a special divine direction. Ver. 12 interrupts the necessary connection of ver. 11 with 13 and is in the highest degree malapropos. The language too heaps together adjectives which in E must have applied only in separate instances; "ringstraked" at one time, "speckled and grised" at another. The matter may perhaps have been derived from E's story of the acquisition of the flock, but in its present position ver. 12 must be due to didactic interpolation. The same remarks apply of course to ver. 10. With the exception of ver. 18 (P) the rest of vs. 1-20 is indisputably E's; but the middle clause of ver. 21 is a new beginning, duplicating the first clause, and 25a is a more remarkable doublet of 23b. Ver. 25b too comes in too late after ver. 24 to belong to E. Ver. 27 also not only duplicates ver. 26, but brings into striking contrast its different expression for denoting the stealthy flight of Jacob (ver. 26, "didst steal my heart;" v. 27, "didst steal me"). All these phenomena are rightly noted by the later critics and the indicated fragments assigned to J. Also the gap in ver. 25, where the name of "the mountain" has been omitted, doubtless in deference to E's narrative which made Mt. Gilead the scene of both camps. In connection herewith, however, it should be noted that only in the J passages in the complicated mosaic at the end of the chapter is there an apparent attempt to furnish an etymology for *two* places; E's narrative confining itself to the name Gal-ee'd (Gilead). Observe also that ver. 31 stands in the worst possible connection with its present context, "Wherefore hast thou stolen my gods?—Because I was afraid," etc. The verse contains really the answer, not to the question which stands immediately before it, but to that of ver. 27 (J), "Wherefore didst thou flee secretly?" On the other hand, by withdrawing

ver. 31, we bring ver. 32 into a better connection after ver. 30. The **וַיֹּאמֶר** of LXX. at the beginning of ver. 32 may then well be genuine, and marks the beginning of Jacob's answer in E.

Both matter and language show that the succeeding verses down to ver. 42 are E's. A single clause, "and into the tent of the two maidservants," has been supplemented in ver. 33, as the last clause of the verse shows; but the mere parallelism of vs. 38 and 41 (Well.) without any trace of divergence in the conception, is scarcely sufficient to suggest the presence of J.

Not until we reach ver. 43 can there be any reasonable doubt of E as the author, but here the impression is very strong upon my mind that the debate between Laban and Jacob in E reaches a conclusion with Jacob's triumphant rejoinder of ver. 42; and that ver. 43 is the answer to Jacob's imputation in ver. 31 (J). In E the *teraphim* are the matter of prime importance. It seems to be J who brings the *daughters* into the front rank of controversy, and instead of Laban appearing in rather humiliating colors, discomfited and put to shame by Jacob, himself and his gods turned to ridicule by Rachel, in J it is Laban who makes decidedly the best appearance, acting a really generous part (vs. 27,43 sq.), while Jacob presents a rather sorry excuse for his flight from a shadow (ver. 31).

Ver. 44 is evidently concerned to furnish an etymology for Gilead (Gal-eed) for **וְהָיָה לְעֵד** "it shall be for a witness" can only refer to some substantive now missing. A clause has been omitted which, as the evidently contemplated etymology suggests, can only have been **וַנַּעֲשֶׂה גֵל** "and make a heap" (Olshausen, Dillmann), in spite of Kautzsch and Socin. The verse thus stands connected with vs. 46-50, where the etymology is developed according to J's style, returning to the word played upon and concluding with his regular **עַל-כֵּן קָרָא שְׁמוֹ גִּלְעָד** "Therefore was the name of it called Gal-eed" (48b). In this passage (vs. 46-50) there has been considerable alteration, transposition and interpolation, as has long been recognized; yet the main characteristics of language are J's, and the subject of the covenant, ver. 50, again agrees with the topic of discussion in vs. 27,31 and 43 (J), and contrasts with that of E, vs. 32-42, 52. Moreover it is Laban who seems to have the best of the argument in these verses of J, and hence Laban also who naturally takes the initiative in the suggestion of the covenant; for as Laban undertakes to tell the meaning of the cairn in vs. 48 sqq., it must be Laban, and not "Jacob" as in the present text, who says to his *brethren*, "Gather stones," etc. Ver. 47 is either, as Wellhausen says, "a very superfluous exhibition of learning" on the part of some interpolator, or else has been removed from between 53a and 53b, and perhaps altered in the process. At any rate it has no place alongside of ver. 48 and is much more than superfluous where it stands. Ver. 48b, the formula with which J's aetiological narratives regularly conclude, can of course originally have stood nowhere but after ver. 50, this verse itself being separated from its true connection with 48a, as has long

been recognized, by the intruder ver. 49. Finally אלהים "God" in ver. 50 is easily recognized as a subject wrongly supplied by some glossator, since it destroys the sense of the narrative. It is not God (*Elohim*), but the cairn (*gal*), which is to be the witness (*ed*) between the parties to the covenant; else the etymology is lost.

It is easy simply to banish ver. 49 from the text as an interloper. Undoubtedly it is in a wrong position and has occasioned the straying of 48b; but the language agrees with the style of J, and one cannot forget the significant gap in ver. 25, where Jacob's camp was also located by J, but in a different place from Laban's. There were then *two* names of places in J's narrative. Did not each have its aetiology? And what other place more likely to be associated with Ramoth-Gilead in this connection than the famous Mizpah of Gilead? It seems to me not at all impossible that in J this verse may have followed upon the story of vs. 48-50 somewhat as follows. [And Jacob set up a stone in the place where he had pitched his tent] and called it Mizpah (Sam. המצבה, LXX. *Μασσηφα*), for he said, Yahweh watch (צפה *tsaphah*) between me and thee when we are hidden one from the other." The erection of *maççebah* or "pillars" is comparatively exceptional in J in contrast with E, but there is abundant evidence in xxxv. 14 and Josh. iv. 20 that they are not unknown to this writer, as erections of the patriarchs, or at least of Jacob. The curious variants of Sam. and LXX. can scarcely be accounted for save as traces of an original play upon the name המצבה *ham-maççebah* "the pillar," which can only have stood in the original J (cf. Well. i. p. 432, note). Is it possible that J was again indulging in a word play, connecting *maççebah* with the stem צפה through the resemblance of מצבה and מצפה?

Vs. 51-54 are again another story of the covenant at Gilead with a different motive (establishment of a boundary line) and a second covenant feast (cf. vs. 46 and 54). Vs. 51 sq. labor under a load of interpolation in the shape of harmonistic redaction which has introduced both cairn and pillar where only one can be intended. That the one which originally stood in E's narrative was, in spite of Kautzsch and Socin, the cairn (*gal*), and not the pillar (*maççebah*), should be sufficiently clear from the fact alone that E is obviously giving also, as J has given already, vs. 48 sq., an etymology of Gilead (*Gal-ed*, not *maççebah-ed*); but there is additional evidence that the cairn belongs here and the pillar is interpolated, in the fact that in the single instance passed over by the interpolator (middle of ver. 52), it is the *cairn* which stands by itself and not the *pillar*. It becomes apparent from this that 51-54 must be regarded as E's story of the covenant at Gilead. But certainly the favorite *maççebah* of E was not left out of this story to appear only in J. No, E also attributes the pillar to Jacob and the cairn to Laban, but here it is naturally Jacob who takes the initiative (vs. 45 and 54), as seems most appropriate after Jacob's speech in ver. 42. The redaction of E's narrative

included beside the introduction of "the pillar" in vs. 51 sq., the supplementation of ver. 53a with the superfluous clause "the God of their father," which contradicts E in Josh. xxiv. 2; and perhaps also the removal (and alteration?) of ver. 47 from between 53a and 53b. With this restoration but few words are lacking to make the narratives of both J and E in ch. xxxi. fairly complete; a result not only gratifying in itself, but corresponding to the procedure of JE as developed in the close inspection of other passages where the strands of J and E are most intimately interwoven.

The above analysis of chs. xxx. and xxxi., as well as the suggestions upon previous passages of difficulty, will prove, let us hope, not barren of valuable deductions and inferences for the historical critic. An improved analysis of the succeeding chapters, especially in Exodus, will certainly afford important results.

▷BOOK ❖ NOTICES.◁

WRIGHT ON COMPARATIVE SEMITIC GRAMMAR.*

The time has not yet come for the preparation of a scientifically satisfactory comparative grammar of the Semitic tongues. Nor does the volume of Wright lay claims to the distinction of being such a work. The title page does not announce it as a comparative grammar, but as lectures on the comparative grammar of these languages. The work does not claim to be a solution of a vexing and perplexing problem, but only a contribution towards its solution. And as such it is entitled to a place in the front rank of purely philological works in the Old Testament literature of the day. Detailed researches in not a few of the leading questions of comparative Semitic grammar have already been made, both in etymology and in syntax. These contributions and preliminary investigations are found in nearly all the larger grammars, such as Olshausen's and Stade's Hebrew grammar, Dillmann's Ethiopic grammar, Wright's Arabic grammar; also in the publications of Lagarde, Nöldeke and others in books, pamphlets and magazine articles, while special researches, such as Driver's discussion of Hebrew tenses, or Philippi on the Status Constructus, and several treatises on the prepositions, on the infinitive and other topics, have handled these individual topics in an almost exhaustive manner. It was time that some specialist should draw the *facit* of what had been done, and intelligently compile and gather together the treasures of thought found so widely scattered. This Wright has done in a manner that makes his work absolutely necessary to the student of the Semitic languages. Very little seems to have escaped him. Nor can it be said that his volume is merely a compilation. It is true that those who have been working in this line will recognize probably in more than one-half of the instances cited matter that has been used and approved by specialists in other works; but a good many of the data are doubtless the result and fruit of Wright's own studies. Naturally it is impossible for any reader to control the correctness of each and every comparison; but as the work is edited by Professor W. Robertson Smith and the proof sheets passed through the hands of "the little giant" of Strassburg, Professor Nöldeke, generally recognized as the leading Semitic scholar of the world, we have a reasonable right to have confidence in the quality of the work done, aside from that already inspired by the established reputation of the author himself.

The book itself grew out of lectures delivered at the University of Cambridge. In all there are nine chapters, treating of introductory matter; of the term Semitic; the original home and the diffusion of the Semites; general survey of the languages; Semitic writing and alphabet; the Vowels and their permuta-

* LECTURES ON THE COMPARATIVE GRAMMAR OF THE SEMITIC LANGUAGES. From the papers of the late William Wright, LL. D., Professor of Arabic in the University of Cambridge. Cambridge: University Press. New York: Macmillan and Co., 1890. Pp. xl, 288. Size 9x6 inches. Price \$3.50.

tions; the Pronouns; the Noun; the Verb (regular); and the Irregular Verb. To these are added a few additional notes and corrections. As is thus seen the work covers only etymology and the forms; the syntax being entirely left out of consideration. As a rule Wright confines himself to the statement and arrangement of the facts and does not endeavor to go further and unravel the mysteries of the philosophy of the Semitic tongues. Doubtless this is the part of wisdom; as we have not yet a sufficient number of facts on all the subjects in question to justify extensive theorizing. Ewald's Hebrew grammar is an illustration of the result of abstract philosophizing without a full foundation of facts. Wright generally takes positions on points *sub judice*, but he is cautious and conservative, only rarely, as in his hypothesis on the Personal pronoun, venturing into deep waters. All these features of the volume make it an excellent handbook for advanced students and for teachers. It is not free from errors. The omission of all mention of Praetorius' *Ethiopic Grammar*, of Merx *Chrestomathia Targumica* and other literature, at the proper places, is to be regretted. Indeed it is almost a crime that this excellent manual has been permitted to appear without any indices whatever! It would have doubled and trebled the value of the work for the student's use if these had been added. For the omission of the indices there can be no excuse whatever, as any wide awake student in this department could have prepared them.

GEORGE H. SCHODDE,
Columbus, Ohio.

KEILSCHRIFTTEXTE ZUM GEBRAUCH BEI VORLESUNGEN.*

Delitzsch's *Lesestücke* has become a household word among students of Assyrian. With its help they have all treaded their way through the maze of the Assyrian syllabary. It is natural that they have conceived a love for it as for an old friend. With the exception of Lyon's *Manual* (which was intended to serve other purposes) and Telson's *Crestomazia*, no serious attempt has been made to improve upon the *Lesestücke*. Messrs. Abel and Winckler—well known from their other joint publications—have attempted to do this. They must have thought that, in some one way or another, Delitzsch's work even in its third edition did not quite satisfy the requirements. And, though they do not expressly state it, the idea that guided them in this is to be found in the first sentence of the preface, "The present publication is intended solely for practical purposes, and wishes only to give beginners a selection of such texts, the study of which will enable them quickly and surely to carry on their studies of their own accord." Their book must, therefore, be judged by their own standard; and that standard is its greater practical usefulness in beginning the study of Assyrian.

The *Keilschrifttexte* has one great advantage to begin with. It is cheap: half again as cheap as the *Lesestücke*. Every student can thus become possessor of a copy. Though it contains only about 102 pages to the 148 of Delitzsch's publication, the amount of material given is much greater, as the whole is more com-

* KEILSCHRIFTTEXTE ZUM GEBRAUCH BEI VORLESUNGEN, herausgegeben von Ludwig Abel und Hugo Winckler. Berlin: W. Speman, 1890.

pressed. In this compression clearness has not been sacrificed as regards the texts. But in one part it has resulted unfavorably for the student,—in the *Schrifttafel*. It is true that we have some 384 signs, against 326 in Delitzsch—undoubtedly the largest collection of signs in any of the current handbooks. But in Abel-Winckler the double column makes the finding of the different signs difficult, especially for beginners. The commentary on each sign is also compressed into one single column, making it impossible for the eye to come to the aid of the searcher. Here the *Lesestücke* with its different columns will commend itself.

What is to be specially commended in this new publication is the selection of the texts. The editors have rightly laid stress upon this. Students will always have to confine themselves, during the first two or three semesters, to historical inscriptions, monumental and other. A large selection of such texts ought to be made readily accessible. This Abel and Winckler have done. They give us forty-eight pages of historical inscriptions arranged in chronological order, from Tiglath Pileser I. to Xerxes. Whilst in Delitzsch we have but a few pages devoted to these historical inscriptions, we have here material enough to give students a thorough induction into the cuneiform script and grammar. The scarcity and unwieldiness of Layard and of the *Rawlinsons* add an additional value to this publication. Several lengthy inscriptions are given entire—of Shalmaneser, Sennacherib, and Esarhaddon. The editors have, however, not kept strictly to the task they themselves have set. As the book is especially intended for students, we could readily have dispensed with the first page, containing the old Assyrian inscriptions from Kalah Shergat; and the last twelve pages as well, which contain seventy-six lines of the Flood story, a few extracts from the syllabaries and a few hymns. Whoever is ripe enough to take up such texts as these will go straight to the originals; and will read, not a bit, but the whole of the text. In a future edition it will be well to omit these pages, and in their place to enlarge the table of signs and arrange it in a little more practical manner. On the whole then as regards the text Abel-Winckler is a decided improvement upon Delitzsch: and it is these texts primarily which will give the new *Keilschrifttexte* entrance into our universities and colleges.

There remains the glossary! I wish I could say the same of it as I have said of the texts. But, measured only by the standard set by the editors themselves, it does not come up to one's reasonable expectations. Why have the Hebrew letters used by Delitzsch in the *Lesestücke* been abandoned? For mere practical purposes it is necessary that the eye of the student catch at once the letters of the root. They should be distinguished in some way. And why, again, have they abandoned the good principle of arranging the words under their respective roots? It is true that our Hebrew dictionaries have not yet climbed to that pinnacle. But this is only one out of a number of their sins of commission and omission. It is confusing for a student to see *tibūtu* separated from *tibū*, *tidūku* from *dāku*, *tidišti* from *idišu*, *limetu* from *lamū*, *libittu* from *labānu*, etc., etc. Otherwise, the glossary makes no pretence to be more than a help to the student. I have gone through a number of the inscriptions with that end in view, and have found all the words duly registered there. To many of the translations and derivations there given scholars will take exception; and, doubtless, Winckler himself—who is alone responsible for this portion of the

work—would now change much in the light which later criticism has thrown upon many of the inscriptions.

The texts are excellently reproduced. Abel has done his work well. The script of the monumental inscriptions (especially the Black Obelisk) is exceedingly clear and bold; whilst the script of the other inscriptions, though evidently modelled after that of the contract tablets, comes very fairly near the actual script of the inscriptions.

Delitzsch's *Lesestücke* is, however, not made superfluous by this new publication. It can well exist side by side with it. It has a worth above and beyond that of a mere text-book. The syllabaries and vocabularies will still have to be studied there, as well as the story of the Flood.

The note on p. 46 is entirely gratuitous. A comparison of the two texts shows not more than four variants!

RICHARD GOTTHEIL,
Columbia College, in the City of New York.

DRIVER'S SAMUEL.*

In his preface, the author discusses the reliability of the MT., which "has suffered unusually from transcriptional corruption," and the history of the textual criticism of the Books of Samuel. Otto Thenius in his *Die Bücher Samuelis* (1842) was the first to point out the value of the LXX. for the study of the MT., and Ewald in 1843 follows closely on the same lines and makes too frequent use of the results of Thenius, without suitable acknowledgment. Driver regards Wellhausen's monogram on the text of the Books of Samuel (1871) as epoch-making. After discussing Wellhausen's methods, he says: "Wellhausen's scholarship is fine: his judgment is rarely at fault; and in the critical treatment of the text, I have been strongly sensible of the value of his guidance. I trust that I may not appear to have used his volume too freely: my excuse, if I have done so, must be that I was writing for English students, most of whom are unacquainted with German; and I could not withhold from them some of the best and soundest results which have been gained for the textual criticism of the Old Testament." The author claims that, notwithstanding his very great indebtedness to Wellhausen, he has always maintained an independent judgment, and a study of the book fully confirms this statement. Driver also acknowledges the value of Klosterman's commentary in Strack and Zöckler's *Kurzgefasster Commentar zu den Heiligen Schriften Alten und Neuen Testaments* (1887), but he regards him as too original, too ingenious, "too apt to assume that the text has suffered more than is probable," and, although scholarly, his restorations are often far-fetched and "betray sometimes a defective appreciation of Hebrew modes of expression."

In his Introduction, Driver discusses

I. The Early History of the Hebrew Alphabet—the כתב and כתב עברי

* NOTES ON THE HEBREW TEXT OF THE BOOKS OF SAMUEL, with an Introduction on Hebrew Palaeography and the Ancient Versions and Facsimiles of Inscriptions, by the Rev. S. R. Driver, D. D., Regius Professor of Hebrew and Canon of Christ Church, Oxford. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1890.

אֲשׁוּרִי, or the so-called Hebrew and Assyrian characters, the latter in later times known as the כְּתָב מְרֻבֵּעַ, or square character; the transition of the former to the latter. He also gives facsimiles of many gems and inscriptions written in the עֵבְרִי, e. g., the inscription of Mesha (as an appendix) and numerous Aramaic, Hebrew, and Phœnician gems. To these are added a transliteration in the square characters, a translation and commentary. The history of the discovery of the Siloam inscription is also given, with transliteration, translation and notes.

II. Early Hebrew Orthography—the division of words. The author thinks that the division of words had been pretty definitely made, and the five final letters introduced before the MT. was established. The LXX., however, often translated from a text with divisions differing widely from those of the MT. He then notices that the *plena scriptio* was rare and that the suffix of the 3 sg. masc. was written הָ instead of וֹ, etc., etc.

III. The Chief Ancient Versions of the O. T.—the MSS., the LXX. (which he regards of very great value for the study of all the books of the O. T., but especially valuable for Samuel, parts of Kings and Ezechiel), Targums, Peshitta, etc. The history of these versions and a conservative estimate of their value are given under this heading, but nothing new is added. It is, however, a valuable collection of facts for the student.

IV. Characteristics of the Chief Ancient Versions of Samuel. Here Driver takes up the characteristics of the versions in great detail. His tables are very valuable for the history of textual criticism and as furnishing a basis for the canons which should guide us in our criticism.

I will now examine a very few of his emendations to the MT. of Samuel, taking the examples from the first Book. In III. 7, we have טָרַם יָרַע, i. e., טָרַם with a Perf., which is very rare. Driver suggests יָרַע the Impf. and his emendation is rendered almost certain by the יָרַע in the parallel. His grammatical note on IV. 15 is very instructive. He adds nothing new to the difficult passage in V. 4, where he would either accept Wellhausen's view that the original was דָּגוּ and the ך has arisen by dittography from the נִשְׁאָר, or simply say that a word had been dropped out of the text. In IX. 24, the difficult הָעֵלִיָּהּ is taken up at length. הָ, with a preposition, with the apparent force of a relative occurs only here. This makes the reading of the MT. very doubtful, and Driver is inclined to read with Geiger, וְהָאֵלִיָּהּ = *the fat tail*. In XII. 7 he would follow the LXX.'s καὶ ἀπαγγελεῖν ὑμῖν and insert וְאֵנִידָה לָכֶם. Cf. his remarks on XII. 21 on the intrusive כִּי. XIII. 1 he would take as a marginal gloss. The last three or four verses of ch. XIII. are very difficult and Driver is not able to give us any help. He regards the הַפְצִירָה פִּים as hopelessly corrupt. In XIV. 16 the וְיִלְךָ is to be corrected with the LXX. to וְהָלַם וְהָלַם = ἐνθεν καὶ ἐνθεν. Why not retain the וְיִלְךָ here and simply insert the first הָלַם which could have been omitted because of second וְהָלַם? In XIV. 18 we must also read with the LXX. הַנִּיֶּשֶׁה הָאֶפֹּד, cf. V. 3 and XXIII. 9. Cf. also his notes on XIV. 21. These examples are sufficient to show his methods, and his position towards the MT. We would have been pleased if he had discussed the literary problems, but these lay without the compass of his book.

In conclusion I would say that Driver has given us a good model for further

work in this line. Every book in the O. T. should be edited as a text-book with textual, grammatical, lexicographical and historical notes. It would also be well to add a glossary of the Hebrew words, so that the Hebrew of any one book could be compared with that of any other. Such critical editions of Hebrew texts would be of great aid not only to the student, but to the higher and lower critics. Driver's lexicographical and grammatical notes are numerous and valuable. He is very conservative. He has made good use of Wellhausen's work on these texts. In the main, he accepts Wellhausen's conclusions. Wellhausen's judgment is seldom at fault, as Driver admits. The texts of Samuel are very corrupt. Every page is full of errors. Driver has attempted to point these out and to correct them. His work has been very successful. The books of Kings should receive similar treatment at once, and all the history furnished by the Assyrian inscriptions should be incorporated in the notes.

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER,
Yale University.

SCHEIL'S ŠAMŠI-RAMMÂN IV.*

In the preface, the author notes the main points of history connected with the inscription, the difficulty of the text, the poor transcription of the Archaic into the late Assyrian script found in I R. and also the fact that this text contains several unusual and difficult Assyrian words.

Then follow a transliteration and translation of the four columns of this inscription. The method of transliteration is essentially that of the Leipzig school, which is much preferable to the usual French or English (Sayce) system.† With the exception of the preface, the book is autographed and one must add that the author's script is poor and careless. The 67 pp. could have been condensed to 24 if put in type, but for this the publisher could not have charged 8 frs. Hence the number of pages.

There are numerous evidences of great carelessness on the part of the author in his transliteration. I can notice only a few examples: In 1:41 he reads ušpalkit and in 2:23 and 3:37 attapalkad and in 4:4 appalkid. In the glossary the stem is given as palkātu. In col. 1, he uniformly writes apal, and later just as uniformly abal, neither of which is correct. In 3:40 we read natbaki and in 4:3 nadbak. There is no consistency in the placing of accents, and in many places the diacritical points of the ḥ and š are omitted—and these mistakes cannot, as is usual, be excused as typographical errors. Both transliteration and translation are to be preferred to those of Ludwig Abel in Schrader's *Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek*. I will notice only a few readings: In 1:3

* INSCRIPTION ASSYRIENNE ARCHAÏQUE DE ŠAMŠI-RAMMÂN IV. Roi d'assyrie (824-811 A.V. J.-C.) transcrite, traduite et commentée par le P. V. Scheil, lecteur en théologie de l'ordre de Saint-Dominique. Paris: H. Welter, 1889, pp. vii and 67.—Tables des matières: Texte et Traduction, 2-30; Commentaire philologique, 31-47; Notes de Géographie, 48-55; Notes d'Histoire, 56, 57; Glossaire, 58-67.

† Comme système de transcription, nous avons préféré le plus scientifique, malgré sa témérité, le système à transcription liée et accentuée.

and 31 Scheil reads mukir (instead of the usual mu-rim) markas šamê and translates *qui tient en mains les rênes du ciel*, etc., taking mukir from a root kâru. He also reads appul and ippul for abbul and ibbul; garduti for kardûti; pad for paṭ; ḥalzâni for ḥalṣâni, etc., etc.

The philological notes bring us nothing new except a few bold readings and derivations which cannot be accepted. For the most part, they are very elementary, being entirely lexicographical. Questions of grammar and syntax have been entirely ignored. The Geographical notes are very meagre and Delitzsch's *Wo lag das Paradies* is closely followed. This inscription is most important for the geography of Assyria and this subject should have received a better treatment. In the glossary, there is no method in the arrangement of the words. For the most part, derivatives are not placed under their respective roots; כ and פ, נ and ק are used indiscriminately and the roots are given in transliteration rather than in the Hebrew. Many mistakes have crept into the glossary, one of the most glaring of which is the placing of muntaḥḥiṣi under taḥâzu.

This book gives us a fairly good translation of the Šamšî-Rammân IV. inscription, but nothing more. It is not adapted to the use of students, being bulky and carelessly written. It is not necessary to the library of an Assyriologist.

ROBERT FRANCIS HARPER,

Yale University.

◀SEMITIC BIBLIOGRAPHY.▶

- ABEL, LUDWIG. Sammlung von Wörterverzeichnissen als Vorarbeiten zu einem Wörterbuch der alten arabischen Poesie. I. Die sieben Mu'allakāt. Text, vollständiges Wörterverzeichnis, deutscher und arabischer Commentar. Berlin: *W. Speman.*M.18—
- ABICHT, R. Donum Wardianum, carmen didacticum de linguae arabicae grammatica a Zainud-Dîn ibn il-Wardi compositum. Breslau: *Preuss.*.....M.2.
- ARNOLT, W. MUSS. Critique of Schrader's Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek. III.2. *Amer. Journ. of Phil.*, XI., No. 4.
- BAETHGEN, FR. Critique of Robertson Smith's Religion of the Semites. *DLZ.*, XII., 11.
- BARTH, J. Critique of A. Bloch's Phöniciisches Glossar. *DLZ.*, XII., 10.
- Die Nominalbildung in den semitischen Sprachen. 2 Hälfte. Die Nomina m. äusserer Vermehrg. Die gebrochenen Plurale. Leipzig: *Hinrichs.*.....M.10.
- BLUDAU, A. De alexandrinae interpretationis libri Danielis indole critica et hermeneutica. Münster: *Aschendorff.*.....M.1.50.
- BRUGSCH, H. Thesaurus inscriptionum aegyptiacarum. 6 Abth. Leipzig: *Hinrichs.*M.90.
- Die biblischen sieben Jahre der Hungersnoth nach dem Wortlaut e. altägyptischen Felsen-Inschrift. Leipzig: *Hinrichs.*...M.5.
- CHEYNE, T. K. Tunip and the Land of Naharina. *Academy*, No. 977.
- Critique of George Adam Smith's The Book of Isaiah; of C. H. H. Wright's An Introduction to the Old Testament; of Karl Budde's Die Bücher Richter und Samuel, ihre Quellen und ihr Aufbau; of F. Giesebrecht's Beiträge zur Jesaiakritik, nebst einer Studie über prophetische Schriftstellerei. *Ibid.*, No. 981.
- G. A. Smith's "Exposition of Isalah XL.—LXVI. *Expositor*, Feb., 1891.
- CLERMONT-GANNEAU, CH. Les antiquités sémitiques. Paris: *Leroux*, 1890.....fr.2.50.
- CONDER, C. R. The Siloam Inscription. *Academy*, No. 979.
- CHARMES, G. L'Egypte: archéologie, histoire, littérature. Paris: *Calmann Lévy.*...fr.3.50.
- EGLI, EMIL. Zweiter Commentar zu Wright's Syrischen Martyrologium. *Zeitsch. f. Wissensch. Theologie*, XLIV., 3.
- ELMSLIE, W. G. Hosea. *Expositor*, Jan., 1891.
- FÜRST, J. Glossarium graeco-hebraeum. 2 u. 3. Lfg. Strassburg: *Trübner.*.....M.1.50.
- GINSBURGER, M. Die Anthropomorphismen in den Thargumim. *Jahrb. f. Prot. Theol.*, XVII., 2.
- GLASER, EDUARD. The Early Civilisation of Arabia. *Academy*, Nos. 974, 975.
- HALÉVY, J. Critique of Bezold's Kurzgefasstes Ueberblick über die bab.-assyrr. Lit.; of Strassmaier's Alphabetisches Verzeichniss, etc.; of Delitzsch's assyrisches Wörterbuch, and of Brünnow's Classified List, etc. *Rev. Critique*, Feb. 2, 1891.
- HARPER, EDWARD T. The Babylonian Legend of Etana. *Academy*, No. 976.
- HERDERSCHEE, I. Het slotvers van 2 Sam. XII. *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 25^{te} Jaargang. 2^{de} Stuk.
- HEUZEY, L. Les origines orientales de l'art. 1^{re} partie. Antiquités chaldée-assyriennes. Livr. 1 et 2. Paris: *Leroux.*.....fr.8.
- HOWORTH, HENRY H. Tunip and the Land of Naharina. *Academy*, Nos. 976, 981.
- HUIZINGA, ABEL H. Analogy in the Semitic Languages. I. *Amer. Journ. of Phil.*, XI., No. 4.
- JEREMIAS, A. Izdubar-Nimrod. Ein altbabylon. Heldensage. Nach den Keilschriftfragmenten dargestellt. Leipzig: *Teubner.*M.2.80.
- KELLOGG, S. H. The Book of Leviticus. (*Expositor's Bible*).....sh.7.6.
- KOSTERS, W. Critique of Driver's Notes on the Hebrew Text of the Books of Samuel. *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 25^{te} Jaargang, 2^{de} Stuk.
- LOISY, A. Critique of BAS. 1. *Rev. critique*, Feb. 23, 1891.
- MACLAGAN, R. Tunip and the Land of Naharina. *Academy*, No. 977.
- MEISSNER, E. Critique of Schrader's Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek. *LCB.*, 1891, No. 7.
- NEUBAUER, A. Tunip. *Academy*, No. 984.
- NÖLDEKE, TH. Critique of Contes arabes édités par le P. A. Salhani. *LCB.*, 1891, No. 5.
- NOWACK, A. Critique of Schrader's Keilinschriftliche Bibliothek. II. *DLZ.*, XII., 13.
- OORT, H. Het vaderland van Amos. *Theol. Tijdschrift*, 25^{te} Jaargang, 2^{de} Stuk.
- RADLOFF, W. Versuch e. Wörterbuches der Türk-Dialecte. 4 Lfg. Leipzig: *Voss.*...M.9.

- SAYCE, A. H. Critique of J. V. Prásek's Medien und das Haus des Kyaxares. *Academy*, No. 976.
- Southern Palestine in the fifteenth century, B. C. *Ibid.*, No. 979.
- The Progress of Egypt in the Destruction of its Ancient Monuments. *Ibid.*, No. 980.
- The Parentage of Queen Teie: Ancient Towns in Palestine. *Ibid.*, No. 981.
- Notes from Egypt. *Ibid.*, No. 982.
- SCHMOLLER, A. Das Wesen der Sühne in der alttestamentlichen Opfertora. *Theo. Stud. u. Kritik.*, 1891, No. 2.
- SCHRADER, EB. Critique of Abel u. Winckler's Keilschrifttexte zum Gebrauch bei Vorlesungen. *DLZ.*, XII., 3.
- SIEGFRIED, C. Critique of Karl Budde's Bücher Richter und Samuel. *DLZ.*, XII., 13.
- STEINSCHNEIDER, M. Critique of Block's Das mosaisch-talmudische Erbrecht. *DLZ.*, XII., 2.
- TAYLOR, J. The Massoretic Text and the Ancient Versions of the Book of Micah... sh.5.
- TOMKINS, H. G. Tunip and the Land of Naharina. *Academy*, Nos. 980, 983.
- Tunip and Dinhaba. *Ibid.*, No. 985.
- TYLER, T. Critique of Cox's Book of Ecclesiastes. *Academy*, No. 986.
- WALLIS, HENRY. The Ancient Egyptian Monuments. *Academy*. Nos. 973, 983.
- WINCKLER, HUGO. Critique of J. V. Prásek's Medien und das Haus des Kyaxares. *DLZ.*, XII., 8.
- WÜSTENFELD, F. Der Imâm el-Schâfi'î und seine Anhänger. 2. Abth. Die gelehrten Schâfi'iten d. 4. Jahrh. d. H. Göttingen: DietrichM.4.